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# Neg

## Top-Shelf

### 1NC Immigration DA

#### a.) Uniqueness – CIR will pass both houses

Richardson 6/13/13 (Charles, “Immigration reform edges forward in the US”, http://blogs.crikey.com.au/worldisnotenough/2013/06/13/immigration-reform-edges-forward-in-the-us/)

Yesterday morning (Australian time) the United States Senate held its first vote on comprehensive immigration reform. It wasn’t on the bill itself, only a motion to proceed to debate – no-one thinks that the current bill is going to be the final version – but it was still an impressive success: with 60 votes needed, the closure motion had 82 in favor and only 15 (all Republicans) against.¶ For their different reasons, both sides want a reform bill passed. For the Obama administration it would be another significant legislative achievement and would provide a path to citizenship for millions of unauthorised immigrants – who, not irrelevantly, might be expected to eventually vote Democrat. For the Republicans, it’s an essential step to try to prove to the voting public, particularly Hispanics, that they are not a bunch of crazy racists.¶ Speaking shortly before the Senate vote, the president pushed strongly for reform, calling the present system “broken” and saying it “hasn’t matched up with our most cherished values.” He made it clear that the bill as it stands is a compromise – “nobody is going to get everything that they want” – but indicated that he was basically happy with it and that, as he put it, “there’s no reason Congress can’t get this done by the end of the summer.”¶ Getting something like the present bill through the Senate won’t be very difficult. The problem is the House of Representatives, where the Republicans hold a majority and where Republican representatives tend to be further to the right and more beholden to nativist voters than their colleagues in the Senate.¶ Even so, the numbers are almost certainly there in the House as well, given that if the Democrats vote solidly they only need 17 Republicans to vote with them for a majority. But the Republican leadership, and particularly speaker John Boehner, have the power to prevent a measure they disapprove of being put to a vote.¶ So the current manoeuvring on the bill is mostly about what needs to be done to win over the House Republican leaders. Interviewed on ABC News this week, Boehner said “I would expect that a House bill will be to the right of where the Senate is,” but seemed clearly open to the idea of a bill being allowed to pass the House with only minority support among Republicans. There is a limit to how far he can go in this direction without alienating his rank-and-file, but if they are going to overthrow him then immigration is probably not the most likely issue.¶ The question then arises whether Republican attempts to amend the bill in the Senate, by the likes of John Cornyn and Rand Paul (both of whom voted to let debate proceed), are genuine moves for a compromise that’s necessary for its ultimate passage, or are really intended to sink reform by producing a bill that Democrats will be unable to support.¶ Molly Ball in the Atlantic looks at just that question, concluding that although some Republicans are irreconcilable, some like Paul are willing to support real reform: “reform proponents aren’t giving up on getting Paul’s vote, though they wonder how high a price they’ll be forced to pay for it.”¶ Jon Chait at New York magazine, who of course is no friend to the Republicans, is more confident that the party has no choice but to accept comprehensive reform:¶ [C]onservatives have not generated anything like the kind of outrage on immigration reform they need to overcome their party elite’s desire to pass a bill. In particular, they have oddly failed to organize around the one chokehold they control, Boehner’s ability to keep a bipartisan bill off the floor. It’s almost as if [Rush] Limbaugh and other conservative entertainers are themselves going through the motions, trying to maintain the loyalty of their own audience while failing to apply the pressure they actually need against the party leadership.

#### b.) Link – [insert one specific to affirmative case you are debating…or]

#### Major shifts in policy towards Latin America cause partisan battles

Whitehead & Nolte 12 (Laurence Whitehead, senior research fellow in politics at Nuffield College, Oxford, and Detlef Nolte, acting president of the GIGA, director of the GIGA Institute of Latin American Studies, professor of political science at the University of Hamburg, Number 6, 2012, <http://www.giga-hamburg.de/dl/download.php?d=/content/publikationen/pdf/gf_international_1206.pdf>, CMR)

US–Latin America relations are routinely managed by multiple bureaucratic agencies, which can act quite autonomously and are often not coordinated via a common ¶ strategy. Obama’s Latin America policy has frequently been hampered by political ¶ polarization and partisan divisions in Congress. „ The intermestic dimension of US–Latin American relations has complicated foreign ¶ policy, because a more self-confident and autonomous majority in Latin America ¶ has sometimes sought a policy shift with regard to highly sensitive topics, such as ¶ drugs, immigration and Cuba.¶ „ One issue area where some would criticize the Obama administration is its slowness ¶ in improving relations with Brazil or placing Brazil on par with, for example, India.¶ „ It is unlikely that Latin America’s modest ranking in US foreign policy will increase ¶ or that Washington’s priorities will shift much after the November 2012 elections.

#### c.) Bipart is key

Sullivan 6/13/13 (Sean, “What the immigration debate will say about compromise in Washington”, http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/the-fix/wp/2013/06/13/what-the-immigration-debate-will-say-about-compromise-in-washington/)

Looking for an instance of bipartisanship in Washington? President Obama has one: Congress’s immigration reform effort.¶ “That’s an example of what we can accomplish when we work on a bipartisan basis,” Obama said Wednesday night at a Democratic National Committee fundraiser in Miami.¶ In one sense, he’s right. A bipartisan “Gang of Eight” crafted a bill that has made it to the Senate floor with the potential to win votes from Republicans and Democrats. But viewed another way, the most crucial tests of just how bipartisan the reform effort is are only just beginning.¶ When lawmakers in both parties are willing to step up and help shepherd bipartisan legislation, it’s only part of the battle in Congress. For evidence of this, consider the recent gun control debate.¶ Advocates of stricter gun laws got what they wanted when Sens. Pat Toomey (R-Pa.) and Joe Manchin (D-W.Va.) stepped forward with an amendment to expand background checks. A Republican sponsor? Check. A Democrat with a strong gun-rights record? Check.¶ Still, the measure failed to win passage. It was a reminder that the most important tests of compromise and bipartisanship come when the final votes are tallied on the House and Senate floors.¶ And when it comes to immigration reform, it’s still not clear what those final tallies will read. Sen. Marco Rubio (R-Fla.), who is in the “Gang of Eight,” has warned that the measure needs tighter border security measures. Even moderate Republican Sen. Mark Kirk of Illinois says he won’t support the package without a stronger security component.¶ Meanwhile, adding too many amendments favored by conservatives could upset Democrats and damage the delicate balancing act the “Gang of Eight” has cultivated for months. And even if the bill passes the Senate, the Republican-controlled House remains a question mark.¶ For his part, Obama — who has reinserted himself into the conversation after taking a hands-off approach for months — was bullish Wednesday that comprehensive reform can win passage soon.¶ “I actually am pretty confident that before the summer is over, I can sign into law comprehensive immigration reform that will strengthen our borders, fix our legal immigration system, and make sure that those who are here and are undocumented can earn their way — in an arduous process, but earn their way — to be full-fledged members of our country,” the president said.¶ If he’s right, then a genuine instance of bipartisanship will have occurred. Without Republican support, Obama simply cannot win what he is asking for. And without some Democratic concessions, Republicans will not sign off. This much is clear.

#### d.) Impact – Immigration reform is key to the economy, competitiveness, and hegemony

Shapiro 3/27 --- president and CEO of the Consumer Electronics Association, the U.S. trade association representing more than 2,000 consumer electronics companies (Gary, “Tech Executives: Immigration Reform a Top Priority”, <http://www.forbes.com/sites/garyshapiro/2013/03/27/tech-executives-immigration-reform-a-top-priority/>, CMR)

Today I join hundreds of leaders in business, finance, technology and policymaking in Silicon Valley for the 2013 Global Technology Symposium. This year’s theme is “Entrepreneurship in the Global World,” a timely subject given the technology community’s leadership in supporting skilled-immigration reform, an issue intertwined with entrepreneurship and America’s standing in the global economy.¶ Entrepreneurship is a key component of “ninja innovation,” a term I coined to describe the principles we must embrace if we’re going to success in business, politics or our personal lives. I look forward to talking more about this important connection at the symposium tonight, but at the core of the discussion is a simple truth: More than being entrepreneurial individuals, we must foster a culture of entrepreneurship in America. That includes finding ways to attract and keep the world’s best and brightest innovators in America to develop products, launch companies, and create jobs.¶ CEOs from AT&T, Cisco, eBay, Facebook, Google, Intel and Yahoo! have led a steady drumbeat in Washington to reform America’s skilled-immigration system. They understand why reform is vital to our nation’s economic well-being.¶ It fuels job creation.¶ A recent study found that the average foreign-born student who graduates from a U.S. university and works in a STEM field – science, technology, engineering and mathematics – will create about 2.62 jobs for American workers.¶ Creating an immigration system that welcomes the world’s best and brightest is not only crucial to our nation but also to the San Jose-Sunnyvale-Santa Clara economy, home to thousands of STEM jobs. A 2011 Bureau of Labor Statistics report finds that STEM occupations accounted for at least 15 percent of total jobs in this area – that’s more than three times the percentage for the U.S. as a whole.¶ That’s why earlier this month, more than 100 executives from the technology sector and leading innovation advocacy organizations, including my organization, the Consumer Electronics Association (CEA)®, signed a letter to President Obama and Congress urging them to create a more open and flexible U.S. immigration system that embraces highly skilled workers.¶ Cisco Chairman and CEO John Chambers said it best, “America’s success has been based upon its ability to attract the best, brightest, and most ambitious individuals. Our country needs a modern immigration policy that further fosters this culture to help spur continued technological innovation and economic growth.”¶ The problem is clearest in the technology industry because of the incredible shortage of qualified workers. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, there are tens of thousands of unfilled jobs requiring highly skilled individuals in STEM fields. Among four top tech firms – IBM, Intel, Microsoft and Oracle – there are 10,000 jobs waiting to be filled.¶ Our outdated and inefficient immigration system is a huge contributor to the shortage. Many high-skilled, foreign-born workers want to come to or stay in America and create jobs here, but our restrictive visa laws send them home after they’ve trained in our universities. Silicon Valley has felt the pain of these policies through a drop in the number of startups founded by foreign-born immigrants. In the past seven years, immigrants founded 43.9 percent of startups, down from 52.4 percent in 2005. Pushing these individuals to the back of the immigration line creates an incentive for them to compete against us by working for other companies abroad.¶ Instead, we should implement reforms like the Immigration Innovation Act, which would nearly double the number of H-1B visas for high-skilled foreign workers.¶ Other measures, like the Start-Up Visa Act, introduced in the Senate, would also encourage innovation here in the U.S. while investing in education for those in STEM fields. These policy prescriptions were included in the tech leaders’ letter to President Obama and Congress as ways to start the debate and come to a compromise. But that doesn’t mean that if Congress and the President fail to enact them the technology industry will not surrender its fight for reform.¶ The Startup Act 3.0 would enhance America’s global competitiveness by encouraging more entrepreneurialism and halt the U.S. brain drain by creating a STEM visa program for up to 50,000 immigrants each year who graduate from U.S. institutions with a master’s or Ph.D. in STEM. It would also create an entrepreneur visa for up to 75,000 immigrant entrepreneurs who register a business, hire at least two non-family member employees, and invest in their business within one year of obtaining the visa.¶ These policy prescriptions were included in the tech leaders’ letter ways to start the debate and come to a compromise. If Congress and the President fail to enact them, the technology industry will keep fighting for reform.¶ After all, the understanding that strategic immigration is good for our economy is gaining traction among the broader public as well. A recent survey found that there is strong desire among likely voters to have an open and flexible immigration system that embraces highly skilled workers. It also found broad support for research and development programs and a stronger federal focus on STEM education. This may be because Americans are becoming increasingly worried that we are losing our global advantage. More Americans believe that the next major technological innovation will come from China (43 percent) rather than from America (30 percent).¶ With the support of most Americans and the bold leadership of tech industry executives, skilled immigration reform should be a no-brainer in Washington. Bipartisan reform is an important and remarkably easy way to help create jobs and innovation at home. We need to keep America in a position of global leadership, and reforming our country’s immigration law is the first step.

#### e.) Collapse of US leadership causes great power war and extinction

Barnett 11 (Thomas P.M., Former Senior Strategic Researcher and Professor in the Warfare Analysis & Research Department, Center for Naval Warfare Studies, U.S. Naval War College American military geostrategist and Chief Analyst at Wikistrat., worked as the Assistant for Strategic Futures in the Office of Force Transformation in the Department of Defense, “The New Rules: Leadership Fatigue Puts U.S., and Globalization, at Crossroads,” March 7, CMR)

Events in Libya are a further reminder forAmericans that we stand at a crossroads in our continuing evolution as the world's sole full-service superpower. Unfortunately, we are increasingly seeking change without cost, and shirking from risk because we are tired of the responsibility. We don't know who we are anymore, and our president is a big part of that problem. Instead of leading us, he explains to us. Barack Obama would have us believe that he is practicing strategic patience. But many experts and ordinary citizens alike have concluded that he is actually beset by strategic incoherence -- in effect, a man overmatched by the job. It is worth first examining the larger picture: We live in a time of arguably the greatest structural change in the global order yet endured, with this historical moment's most amazing feature being its relative and absolute lack of mass violence. That is something to consider when Americans contemplate military intervention in Libya, because if we do take the step to prevent larger-scale killing by engaging in some killing of our own, we will not be adding to some fantastically imagined global death count stemming from the ongoing "megalomania" and "evil" of American "empire." We'll be engaging in the same sort of system-administering activity that has marked our stunningly successful stewardship of global order since World War II. Let me be more blunt: **As the guardian of globalization**, **the U.S. military has been the** greatest force for peace the world has ever known. **Had America been removed from the global dynamics that governed the 20th century**, the **mass murder never would have ended**. Indeed, it's entirely conceivable **there would now be** no identifiable human civilization left**, once** nuclear weapons **entered the killing equation.**  But **the world did not keep sliding down that path of perpetual war**. **Instead, America stepped up and changed everything by ushering in our now-**perpetual great-power peace. **We introduced the international liberal trade order known as** globalization and played loyal Leviathan over its spread. **What resulted was the collapse of empires,** an explosion of democracy, the persistent spread of human rights, the liberation of women, the doubling of life expectancy, a roughly 10-fold increase in adjusted global GDP **and a profound and persistent reduction in battle deaths from** state-based conflicts. That is what American "hubris" actually delivered. Please remember that the next time some TV pundit sells you the image of "unbridled" American military power as the cause of global disorder instead of its cure. With self-deprecation bordering on self-loathing, we now imagine a post-American world that is anything but. Just watch who scatters and who steps up as the Facebook revolutions erupt across the Arab world. While we might imagine ourselves the status quo power, we remain the world's most vigorously revisionist force. As for the sheer "evil" that is our military-industrial complex, again, let's examine what the world looked like before that establishment reared its ugly head. The last great period of global structural change was the first half of the 20th century, a period that saw a death toll of about 100 million across two world wars. That comes to an average of 2 million deaths a year in a world of approximately 2 billion souls. Today, with far more comprehensive worldwide reporting, researchers report an average of less than 100,000 battle deaths annually in a world fast approaching 7 billion people. Though admittedly crude, these **calculations suggest a 90 percent absolute drop and a** 99 percent **relative** drop in deaths due to war. We are clearly headed for a world order characterized by multipolarity, something the American-birthed system was designed to both encourage and accommodate. But given how things turned out the last time we collectively faced such a fluid structure, **we would do well to keep U.S. power, in all of its forms**, deeply embedded in the geometry to come. To continue the historical survey, after salvaging Western Europe from its half-century of civil war, the U.S. emerged as the progenitor of a new, far more just form of globalization -- one based on actual free trade rather than colonialism. America then successfully replicated globalization further in East Asia over the second half of the 20th century, setting the stage for the Pacific Century now unfolding.

### Will Pass – 2NC UQ Wall

#### Will pass – bipartisan momentum

Dickerson 6/24 (John, “An overwhelming majority of senators hopes to bully the house into passing immigration reform”, <http://www.slate.com/articles/news_and_politics/politics/2013/06/senate_immigration_reform_vote_how_a_70_vote_bipartisan_majority_might_not.html>, CMR)

Later this week, the Senate will pass comprehensive immigration reform, and that’s supposed to give the bill momentum in the House. "We’re working to get a very substantial bipartisan majority," said Republican Sen. John Hoeven. "That’s going to help in terms of actually getting the bill all the way through the House and into law." Democratic Sen. Chuck Schumer, a member of the Senate Gang of Eight that has crafted the bill, and also a former member of the House, says that, "Having a significant number of Republicans will change the dynamic in the House."

#### Momentum theory confirms our argument – strong Senate passage will overcome all existing hurdles and lock-in House passage

Dickerson 6/24 (John, “An overwhelming majority of senators hopes to bully the house into passing immigration reform”, <http://www.slate.com/articles/news_and_politics/politics/2013/06/senate_immigration_reform_vote_how_a_70_vote_bipartisan_majority_might_not.html>, CMR)

Momentum Theory is based on the principle that the more votes the bill gets in the Senate, the better the bill is. The rare coming-together of both parties in the Senate might make low-information voters think the bill is in the category of other unassailable good things senators support in large majorities: the American military, national holidays, and Social Security checks. If people don't see Republicans and Democrats collapsing into their usual predictable squabbles—particularly on such a contentious issue—that must mean the path they've agreed on is a wise one. If Momentum Theory is true, polls should show voters increasingly behind the measure. That would pressure those House members whose opposition to reform is not absolute but flavored with some concern about the public will or the national image of the Republican Party. This is why supporters of reform are pushing to run up the Senate vote total to build the bandwagon feeling. On CNN, Schumer took this theory to its stratospheric conclusion, claiming that if the Senate bill is blocked it would result in a protest of “a million people on the Mall in Washington.”¶ A big Senate victory would also give supporters a way to minimize future debate about the controversial portions of the bill. The House is expected to pass a series of smaller immigration bills but no path to citizenship, which is the heart of the Senate effort. If a House Republican takes issue with a particular element of Senate reform, a supporter will claim the issue was already debated and resolved in the Senate. Charges of bigotry are always just below the surface in the immigration debate. If the perception is that the Senate has already worked through the tough issues, then House skepticism will be easier to frame as being motivated by bigotry instead of policy concerns. The charges won't be coming just from liberals. The Wall Street Journal’s conservative editorial page has conveyed that sentiment already about those who oppose reform. Since a number of Republicans worry about how the party is perceived by voters as it debates this issue in public, fear of looking intolerant will be pronounced, putting even more pressure on lawmakers in the House to ratify the Senate version. ¶ Those who oppose comprehensive immigration reform have already lost in the Senate. Their best chance to defeat the bill is to make the Senate process the enemy. “I cannot support an amendment cobbled together at the eleventh hour that doubles the border patrol without knowing how much it will cost or whether it is even the right strategy, said Sen. John Cornyn, a Republican from Texas. This opposition seeks to jujitsu the successful Senate vote, turning it into an argument against the legislation.

#### Pass both houses – momentum ensures vote count

Chaffee 6/14/13 (Joshua, “Bill Clinton on immigration: “55 or 60%”chance it will pass”, <http://tv.msnbc.com/2013/06/14/bill-clinton-on-immigration-55-or-60chance-it-will-pass/>)

Former President Bill Clinton is “bullish” that Congress will pass comprehensive immigration reform. Speaking to Alex Wagner on NOW Friday, Clinton expressed optimism about the legislation but suggested Speaker John Boehner would need to break the so-called Hastert rule to do it.¶ The former president believes there will be enough votes to pass an immigration reform bill, but asks, “Will [Speaker Boehner] allow a bill to be brought to the floor of the House that does not have the support of a majority of his own caucus, but clearly would get a big bipartisan majority in the House?”¶ So far, Boehner isn’t showing his cards. The Speaker said Tuesday there was “no question” that immigration reform would be passed in the House and Senate and signed by the end of this year. But he started walking that back on Thursday, saying “I don’t intend to bring an immigration bill to the floor that violates what I and what members of my party–what our principles are.”

#### Growing support – strong Senate pressure ensures House acceptance

Nakamura 6/11/13 (David, “Obama reenters immigration-reform arena as Senate begins debate on bipartisan bill”, http://articles.washingtonpost.com/2013-06-11/politics/39887343\_1\_immigration-overhaul-president-obama-senate-group)

Senate proponents of the legislation have said they hope to win up to 70 votes to pressure the GOP-controlled House to accept the major components of the bill. Advocates also said they were encouraged by Obama’s return to the issue after months of focusing on gun control, the budget and foreign policy.¶ In his speech, the president highlighted a broad swath of support for the bill, appearing with AFL-CIO President Richard Trumka, U.S. Chamber of Commerce President Thomas Donohue, former George W. Bush administration commerce secretary Carlos Gutierrez, business executive Steve Case, San Antonio Mayor Julian Castro (D) and others.

#### Will pass – atmosphere of bipartisanship ensures momentum and compromise

Sunday Dispatch 6/15/13 (“Hope of progress on immigration bill”, <http://psdispatch.com/news/otheropinion/600551/Hope-of-progress-on-immigration-bill>)

After years of rancorous debate and at least one election in which Hispanics flexed their political muscle, an immigration reform bill is moving forward in the U.S. Senate. On Tuesday, the Senate voted overwhelmingly, 84-15, to begin final debate on the “Gang of Eight” — four Democrats and four Republicans — immigration bill.¶ The compromise is really about two issues: border security and a path to citizenship. Republicans demanded the former, Democrats the latter. The fate of immigration reform will ultimately depend on the willingness of each side to find the right compromise.¶ That’s why Senate Republicans and Democrats have consistently crossed party lines to vote down amendments that would tip the balance too far one way or the other.

#### Senate vote count

UPI 6/16 (The Issue: Immigration reform bill finally hits Senate floor, http://www.upi.com/Top\_News/US/2013/06/16/The-Issue-Immigration-reform-bill-finally-hits-Senate-floor/UPI-74111371375000/#ixzz2WOPekgUk)

Debate finally began on the U.S. Senate floor last week on the bipartisan immigration reform bill seen as the best opportunity in a while -- or for a while -- to overhaul the nation's immigration laws.¶ Senate supporters still must fend off opponents' "poison pill" amendments designed to nothing more than scuttle the Border Security, Economic Opportunity and Immigration Modernization Act. However, Senate leaders and vote-counters expressed confidence the bill would pass with 60 votes, and possibly 70, before the July 4 recess.

#### Growing bipartisan support – passes both houses

Nevarez 6/15 (Griselda, “Deferred action seen as turning point in fight for immigration reform”, http://www.voxxi.com/deferred-action-immigration-reform/#ixzz2WOQIpTNL)

In recent months, key Republican leaders in the Senate and House have stepped up to the plate to draft an immigration reform bill and other Republicans have endorsed the legislation. Democrats have also been key in drafting the bill and garnering support for it.¶ There’s also a growing list of individuals who up until recently, were unlikely supporters of immigration reform. The list includes Tea Party leaders, evangelicals and conservative lawmakers.¶ What’s more, support for immigration reform among the general public is perhaps the strongest it’s ever been. A poll released Thursday shows there is overwhelming bipartisan support for the immigration legislation proposed in the Senate by the “Gang of Eight.” In the 29 states polled, public support for the bill ranges from 61 percent to 78 percent.¶ “This is the best chance in a generation to enact immigration reform with a path to citizenship,” Sharry said during a call with reporters Thursday. “The American people strongly support the effort, it is in the best interest of both parties to deliver on the promise of reform, and our movement is getting stronger every day.”

#### Will pass but its tight

Cowan 6/7 [Richard, Columnist focused on Congressional policy, “Immigration Reform Backers Insist Bill Will Pass Within a Few Weeks”, Reuters, 6/7/13, <http://www.rawstory.com/rs/2013/06/07/immigration-reform-backers-insist-bill-will-pass-within-a-few-weeks/>, CMR]

The “Border Security, Economic Opportunity and Immigration Modernization Act,” a nearly 900-page reworking of the nation’s 27-year-old immigration law, faces a tough fight in the Democratic-held Senate and an even harder battle in the more conservative House of Representatives later this year.¶ At its core is a plan to move 11 million people residing in the United States illegally – many of whom came from Mexico years ago – out of their illegal status and onto a 13-year path to citizenship.¶ At the same time, the legislation would spend around $6 billion more to strengthen border security and would change the way temporary visas are issued, putting more emphasis on helping U.S. farmers and high-tech industries get foreign labor.¶ “It is gratifying to see the momentum behind this package of common-sense reforms, which will make our country safer and help 11 million undocumented immigrants get right with the law,” Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid said.¶ While he promised to give senators ample opportunity to change the bill – a few dozen amendments are expected – Reid also warned that he would not allow opponents to debate the measure endlessly. Work on the bill will be wrapped up before the July 4 recess, Reid, a Nevada Democrat, said.¶ The bill’s handling of the 11 million undocumented residents is particularly problematic for many Senate Republicans who see it as rewarding people who broke the law by entering the United States illegally while others waited in foreign lands for their applications to be processed.¶ “We can’t reject a dutiful, good person to America and then turn around and allow someone else who came in illegally to benefit from breaking our laws to the disadvantage of the good person,” said Republican Senator Jeff Sessions of Alabama.¶ Sessions, who has been a leading voice against the legislation, added: “It will definitely give amnesty today” to the 11 million.¶ Sessions and other senators are expected to push for greater border security efforts and are also likely to try to eliminate the pathway to citizenship for the 11 million.¶ Nevertheless, backers of the bill were confident that it will pass within a few weeks, putting the onus on the Republican-controlled House to tackle the immigration overhaul, a top issue to Hispanic voters who mainly backed Obama in last year’s election.¶ Republican Senator John McCain, a member of the “Gang of Eight” that wrote the legislation, said he remains optimistic that there are at least 60 votes in the 100-member chamber to pass the bill, the number needed to clear any procedural roadblock.¶ “We’ve got over 60 votes. I’m confident of that,” McCain told Reuters.¶ He said he believed that by the time the amendment process ends, backers will have 70 votes on passage, the number supporters are aiming for to put pressure on the House to act.¶ “There are some real concerns about border security that we have to work through, but I’m confident that we will be able to do so,” McCain said.

#### More warrants and reasons it will pass -

**First, Graham**

**Wasson 6/16**

[Eric, political staff writer, “Graham predicts 'breakthrough' passage of immigration bill with over '70 votes'” The Hill, 6/16/13, <http://thehill.com/blogs/blog-briefing-room/news/305827-graham-predicts-breakthrough-passage-of-immigration-bill-with-over-70-votes#ixzz2WR4g4fib>]

Sen. Lindsey Graham (R-S.C.) on Sunday **predicted overwhelming congressional passage** of an immigration reform bill.¶ “I think we are going to have a political breakthrough, that Congress is going to pass immigration reform,” Graham said on NBC's Meet the Press.¶ He said the Senate will give the reform bill — which currently has a path to citizenship for the nation's 11 million illegal immigrants — **overwhelming support**.¶ “I think we are going to get **plus 70 votes**,” he said. “I've never been more optimistic about it.”¶ Graham said passing the bill is a political necessity for the GOP.¶ “If we don't pass immigration reform, if we don't get it off the table in a reasonable, practical way, it doesn't matter who we run in 2016,” he said. “**We're in a demographic death spiral** as a party.¶ The only way we can get back in the good graces of the Hispanic community, in my view is pass comprehensive immigration reform.”

**second, rubio—will swing votes**

**Mali 6/16**

[Meghashyam, Hill politics editor, “Sen. Rubio Says Most of Immigration Reform Bill in ‘Perfect Shape’” The Hill, 6/16/13, <http://thehill.com/video/senate/305825-sen-rubio-says-most-of-immigration-reform-bill-in-perfect-shape#ixzz2WRJM77JP>]

Sen. Marco Rubio (R-Fla.) on Sunday said that much of the Gang of Eight’s immigration reform bill was in “**perfect shape**,” but added he would insist on tougher border security measures.¶ Rubio, one of the authors of the bill, was asked if he still supported it on ABC’s “This Week.”¶ ¶ “I think it's an excellent starting point, and I think 95, 96 percent of the bill is in perfect shape and ready to go. But there are elements that need to be improved. **This is how the legislative process is supposed to work,” said Rubio**.¶ The Tea Party favorite, **seen as critical to winning conservative support** for the measure, has called for more stringent border security requirements.¶ On Sunday Rubio declined to say if he would vote against the bill without those added provisions.¶ “I don't really want to get involved in these hypotheticals and ultimatums,” he said.¶ **Rubio said he was optimistic** that senators could craft a border deal.

**Err neg—their evidence is biased**

**Salter 6/14**

[Mark, former chief of staff (McCain), “Amid Immigration Reform Cacophony, Passage Looms,” Real Clear Politics, 6/14/13, <http://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2013/06/14/amid_immigration_reform_cacophony_passage_looms_118816.html#ixzz2WR8FIYDP>]

Losing sight of the forest for the trees is a paradox of the 24/7 news cycle, which often pays equal attention to important and insignificant political developments, and important and insignificant players. The kind of granular and excited press scrutiny applied to the debate on immigration reform legislation, for example, where it seems almost anything uttered on the subject by almost anyone can get a quick headline in Politico, makes it harder to judge the bill’s prospects.¶ Who whispered what to whom in the cloakroom or which senator’s offhand comment as he stepped into an elevator signaled progress, or which senator’s peevishness in a caucus meeting pointed to trouble for the bill aren’t likely to tell us anything other than the obvious.¶ ¶ One hundred members of the Senate are presently engaged in debating a sweeping and complex measure on an issue of considerable political importance to both parties. They have different views on the subject and various motives for their actions, and they will all have something to say about it before the debate is over. But, as with any institution, some of its members will have a greater say over the ultimate fate of the legislation than will others.¶ So, who matters and who doesn’t? Well, for starters, **you can put most members of both parties in the “they don’t really matter very much**” category. That’s a bit of an exaggeration and not entirely fair. They all have a vote, and anyone who votes in the majority will have played a small but limited role in the bill’s success or failure.¶ So, let’s refine the category to those members of Congress whose minds on the subject are firmly made up, who won’t change their position no matter how much the bill is amended during the debate, but who won’t take a leadership position in efforts to support or defeat it. At it happens, that category includes most members in both parties.¶ They’ll make statements during the debate to explain their position and try to inoculate themselves from whatever political risks they’re taking, if any. Supporters will insist they don’t back amnesty and opponents will insist they aren’t anti-immigrant. (For the purposes of this debate, that mostly translates into saying they aren’t anti-Hispanic; some of their best friends are Hispanic, and, in a couple of cases, even their parents.) But you could write the platitudes for them and what they say and do won’t affect the bill’s prospects one way or another.¶ **Ted Cruz belongs in this category**. He won’t support the bill no matter how it is amended. And **he won’t play much of a role in convincing others** to oppose it because those members who value his opinion on the matter have already made their minds up to oppose it as well.¶ Given the amount of press attention he’s received since arriving in the Senate, it seems obvious that Cruz sees this issue as he sees every other major issue -- as an opportunity to preen about how he’s standing up for his principles against the sell-out Republican squishes in Washington. Never mind that his principles aren’t always as inviolate as he likes to make them out to be, and they rarely include the principle of discharging the responsibility to govern that he asked the voters of Texas to grant him. The only thing that seems to matter to Mr. Cruz Goes to Washington is what his country can do for him.¶ Rand Paul might matter -- if he is, as he insists is the case, genuinely interested in shaping a comprehensive bill he can support. He could influence other libertarian-leaning Republicans. But he’s not serious if he continues to demand an amendment that effectively sunsets the bill pending a future Congress’ judgment about whether the border security provisions worked as advertised.¶ Future Congresses aren’t bound by the actions of past Congresses. If five or 10 years from now Congress decides the bill didn’t achieve its objectives, it can pass new legislation. But it ought to do it by regular order, facing the same difficulties and political risks this Congress faces as it tries to pass this one.¶ The Gang of Eight matters. Any member who’s working to address the concerns of colleagues who are persuadable for or against the bill matters. Persuadable members matter.¶ Who else matters? John Boehner, who recently suggested to ABC’s George Stephanopoulos that he will allow the House to vote on immigration reform even if a majority of Republican members haven’t agreed support it. If the House speaker means that, **it’s probably the only real news on the immigration debate** this week. Because -- and here’s a fact that really matters -- **majorities in both chambers already support** comprehensive immigration reform, and it will probably have a filibuster-proof majority in the Senate.¶ To the feigned horror of Ted Cruz, the **leadership of both parties wants it to pass** (although some Republican leaders aren’t always eager to publicly admit it). The GOP’s most recent vice presidential nominee wants it to pass, as do most Republican leaders who care about the GOP’s future as a national party. Which means, no matter how many “Perils of Pauline” stories you read in the press, **immigration reform is probably going to be enacted. And that’s the forest** lurking behind the trees of Washington’s indiscriminate hyperbole.

**Bipartisanship**

**Stuart 6/11**

[Elle, Research Assistant, Foreign Policy Fellows Program at New America Foundation, “Immigration Reform: Bipartisanship's Improbable Poster Child,” New America Foundation, 6/11/13, <http://inthetank.newamerica.net/blog/2013/06/immigration-reform-bipartisanships-improbable-poster-child>]

You could forgive Tamar Jacoby and Simon Rosenberg if they had a cynic’s déjà vu. The two advocates have traveled down the comprehensive immigration path before. They were there in 2006 and 2007, when a few brave souls tried to pass a bipartisan grand deal on immigration and failed. So why is it that both Jacoby and Rosenberg, the Republican and Democratic representatives for New America’s conversation on immigration reform, are cautiously optimistic about the hopes for immigration reform in 2013? **Is the need to “get something done” good enough to get something done?**¶ First, the process has had its own rewards. Rosenberg, president and founder of the center-left think tank NDN, opened up the discussion by asserting that the so-called “Gang of Eight” discussions have really worked, **forging a durable bipartisan core** that has **fended off efforts** to derail a deal. He said that the “compromises in the bill were understandable. Democrats didn’t accept things that they didn’t get anything in return for. **Everybody got something, everybody gave something**.” Jacoby, President and CEO of ImmigrationWorks USA, agreed, saying that “a year ago, if you said Republicans would be full partners in comprehensive immigration reform, people would have laughed. What’s astonishing is that once you have the will, people still know how to negotiate.” Both panelists reiterated their optimism about the bipartisan nature of negotiations in the Senate, while expressing a shared hope that the grittier details of the negotiations would not derail a desire to “get something done” that seems to be pervading both parties. **Republicans recognize they lost the Latino vote badly in 2012; Democrats know they need to keep a promise made to immigration advocates**.

**laundry list—overcomes aff warrants**

**Barro 6/11**

[Josh, current politics editor at Business Insider, Former Senior Fellow at the Manhattan Institute for Policy Research, “It’s Over: Comprehensive Immigration Reform Is Going To Pass”, 6/11/13, http://www.businessinsider.com/its-over-comprehensive-immigration-reform-is-going-to-pass-2013-6]

This Congress only acts when it absolutely has to. We got a resolution to the fiscal cliff and a debt ceiling increase because those were necessary. We won't get tax reform or a sequestration replacement because those are optional.¶ This week, we learned that **Republicans really do view passing comprehensive immigration reform as an imperative**. I'm ready to call this: **It's going to pass.**¶ There have been two big developments. One is that House Speaker John Boehner won't rule out passing a bill that lacks majority support from the Republican caucus — likely the only way a bill with a path to citizenship can pass the House.¶ The other is that Sen. Kelly Ayotte (R-N.H.) announced her support for the comprehensive Senate bill. Crucially, the Huffington Post reports that Sen. Marco Rubio (R-Fla.), a member of the pro-reform Gang of Eight, was actually urging Ayotte to delay announcing her support.¶ This is weird, but there's a reason. Rubio and other pro-reform conservatives want changes to the bill. Roughly, these are the proposals that Sen. John Cornyn (R-Tex.) is going to put forward in an amendment to spend more on border security and delay the normalization of status for unauthorized immigrants until border agents are apprehending at least 90 percent of people trying to cross the border illegally.¶ Democrats view this as a poison pill that will delay legalization indefinitely, and they really don't want it in the bill. To get it, Rubio and Cornyn have to convince them that the only way to get enough Republican votes for passage is to include such a provision. They need people like Ayotte to hold out. But the forces within the GOP that favor immigration reform are **too strong for that to happen**.¶ Establishment Republican forces in Washington **desperately want comprehensive reform** with a path to citizenship and an increase in legal immigration. Business interests view reform as something that will grow the economy and create opportunities for investment; they may also hope that it will push wages down.¶ Republican operatives believe that passing immigration reform is a necessary step to improve the party's standing with the growing Hispanic demographic.¶ Not only do these constituencies really want a bill, **they don't care about border security** and so they don't even view the Cornyn Amendment as a bonus. Rubio and Cornyn's meddling with the bill is all downside.¶ A comprehensive bill **will pass the Senate** with the votes of enough Republicans to get past 60 votes. When it gets to the House, Boehner will be in an uncomfortable position: **There will be enough votes for passage**, but most of his caucus will vote against it, and some will be angry that he brought it up.¶ But that would be true even if the Senate bill were amended to Rubio and Cornyn's liking. Most House Republicans won't vote for any bill with a path to citizenship. And there is a key difference between not wanting to vote for a comprehensive immigration reform bill and not wanting one to pass.¶ For many, many House Republicans, the ideal situation is for a reform bill to pass over their objections. Business interests will get the bill they want, Democrats will be deprived of a powerful talking point with Hispanic voters, and individual house members will be able to tell conservative primary voters that they tried to "stop amnesty." Win, win, win.¶ This is why **Boehner isn't as "embattled**" as you often hear. He's a useful punching bag for the conservatives in his own caucus, who know that Republicans must agree to various things that conservative primary voters hate. That's the role he's preparing to play again on immigration.

**Boehner**

**Lee 6/11**

[Esther Yu-Hsi, Immigration Reporter at Center for American Progress, “Boehner Believes That Immigration Bill Will Pass By End of The Year,” Think Progress, 6/11/13, <http://thinkprogress.org/immigration/2013/06/11/2133891/boehner-immigration-bill-pass-end-of-year/>]

House Speaker John Boehner (R-OH) said that the Senate immigration bill **has a likely chance** of being signed into law by President Obama by the end of the year, during an interview on ABC News with George Stephanopoulos that aired on Tuesday. Boehner gave his support for immigration reform, but **did not rule out** bringing a bill to the floor that does not have the support of a majority of the House Republican caucus. He did indicate that the Senate bill does not go far enough to secure the border and deferred to the House when asked about his position for the inclusion of a path to citizenship.

#### Immigration reform will pass – strong, bipartisan passage in the Senate will clear the way for House passage

Benen 5/22/13 (Steven, “Immigration reform advances with bipartisan backing”, <http://maddowblog.msnbc.com/_news/2013/05/22/18418751-immigration-reform-advances-with-bipartisan-backing?lite>, CMR)

The question isn't whether comprehensive immigration reform will pass the Senate; the question is when and by what margin.¶ A sweeping bill to overhaul the nation's immigration system cleared its first major hurdle late Tuesday night, with the 18-member committee charged with completing a first round of legislative edits voting to advance the amended bill to the full Senate.¶ The vote in the Senate Judiciary Committee was 13-5.¶ Three Republicans - Sens. Jeff Flake of Arizona, Lindsey Graham of South Carolina and Orrin Hatch of Utah -- joined the panel's 10 Democrats to vote in favor of the bill.¶ The floor debate will begin shortly after Memorial Day, and Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell (R-Ky.) told reporters yesterday the Republican leadership will not use procedural tactics to try to block the legislation. It raises the possibility of an extraordinarily rare sight: major legislation receiving an up-or-down vote on the Senate floor without a GOP filibuster.¶ That said, yesterday's success was not easy, and it came at a cost. Most notably, Senate Judiciary Committee Chairman Pat Leahy (D-Vt.) pushed for an amendment to allow U.S. citizens to apply for permanent resident status on behalf of their same-sex partners. Republicans threatened to kill the entire reform package if Democrats approved Leahy's measure, and while Democrats supported the amendment, they weren't willing to derail the entire bill over this provision. Left with no good options, Leahy grudgingly pulled his amendment, rather than force his Democratic colleagues to vote against the measure they liked.¶ It was a reminder that the bipartisan reform bill, despite its strengths, is "imperfect."¶ So, what happens now?¶ The "Gang of Eight" bill is expected to remain intact and appears to be on track for passage. Whether there's a Republican filibuster or not, the votes are in place, and "Gang of Eight" members continue to lobby their on-the-fence colleagues in the hopes of creating an even larger majority.¶ Why bother if the bill already has the votes needed to pass? Because proponents want to send a signal to the House by running up the score -- it's one thing for the lower chamber to look askance at a partisan bill that ekes out a narrow victory in the Senate; it's something else for the House to kill a bipartisan Senate bill that passes with 70 or more votes.¶ And at this point, that's apparently the goal. The legislation reportedly enjoys the unanimous support of the Democratic caucus (55 votes), plus the Republicans on the "Gang of Eight" (4 more votes), plus the likely support of some GOP moderates (Collins + Kirk = 2 more votes), and proponents believe as many as 10 other Republicans, including Hatch and Cornyn, are in play.¶ The goal is to put as much pressure as possible on the House, and at this point, the plan is coming together nicely.

#### Momentum ensures compromise deal that passes both houses

Ferrechio 5/27/13 (Susan, Chief Congressional Correspondent, “House, Senate nearing showdown over immigration reform”, <http://washingtonexaminer.com/house-senate-nearing-showdown-over-immigration-reform/article/2530506?custom_click=rss>, CMR)

Congress may be on the verge of striking a long-awaited deal on immigration reform when it returns to work after the Memorial Day recess, but lawmakers caution that a final compromise is far from assured.¶ Democratic Senate leaders pledge to take up a bipartisan compromise authored by the Gang of Eight senators in June. But a separate bipartisan group is crafting a House version of the bill that House Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi, D-Calif., said could be merged with the Senate version before Congress' summer recess in August.¶ "We are optimistic about the prospects," Pelosi said.¶ House Speaker John Boehner, R-Ohio, said he is "confident that we'll have a solid work product that we can go to conference with the Senate."¶ House lawmakers working on their own immigration bill were buoyed last week when the Senate Judiciary Committee backed the Senate plan by a wide margin. The Senate bill couples new border security measures with a path to citizenship and instant legalization for illegal immigrants who came to the U.S. before 2012.¶ After the Senate panel cleared the measure, Minority Leader Mitch McConnell, R-Ky., announced he would not block efforts to bring the bill to the Senate floor.¶ "I think the Gang of Eight has made a substantial contribution to moving the issue forward," McConnell said. "And so I'm hopeful we'll be able to get a bill that can pass here in the Senate."¶ The Senate committee's approval also provided "wonderful momentum" for House negotiators, said Rep. Luis Gutierrez, D-Ill., who is helping write the House immigration bill.

#### Reconciliation ensures compromises that resolve existing issues – passes both houses by August

Sweet 5/27/13 (Lynn, “Lynn Sweet: Immigration-reform deal could pass by August: Pelosi”, <http://www.suntimes.com/news/sweet/20378242-452/lynn-sweet-immigration-reform-deal-could-pass-by-august-nancy-pelosi-says.html>, CMR)

WASHINGTON — House Democratic Leader Nancy Pelosi (D-Calif.), who hits Chicago this week along with President Barack Obama for fund-raising events to benefit Illinois House Democrats, told me Monday that there is enough “general agreement” on bipartisan immigration reform for a measure to pass — and she laid out an aggressive timetable, saying a bill could be sent to Obama to sign by August.¶ Pelosi also underscored in our interview that she wants the House to have its own bipartisan immigration bill. The Senate bipartisan measure is already out of committee and set to hit the Senate floor in June. If people in Washington thought otherwise — that she wanted to wait on the Senate (and I have read some stories with that suggestion) — they are wrong.¶ “We can be working simultaneously,” she told me in the phone interview, speaking from San Francisco, where she marked Memorial Day.¶ While the House bipartisan immigration proposals will likely end up being more conservative than the legislation already advanced in the Democratic-controlled Senate, Pelosi wants a House bill for a practical reason: To get to 218 votes in the GOP-run House — and assuming massive Democratic support — there has to be something in the immigration bill to get the support of about 30 Republicans.¶ That’s also the pragmatic position of Rep. Luis Gutierrez (D-Ill.), one of eight members of the House bipartisan task force. Gutierrez “has really been our champion,” Pelosi said. “He has been a real force.”¶ Pelosi lands in Chicago on Tuesday for two days of fund-raising and, time permitting, the Rolling Stones concert Tuesday night at the United Center.¶ On Tuesday, Pelosi will be the keynoter at a “Women for Brad” reception at the Hilton Northbrook for freshman Rep. Brad Schneider (D-Ill.), who is heading toward a 10th District rematch in 2014 with former Rep. Bob Dold, a Republican. The chief co-hosts are the four Democratic women in the Illinois delegation: Reps. Jan Schakowsky, Tammy Duckworth, Cheri Bustos and Robin Kelly.¶ On Wednesday morning, Pelosi will team up with Schakowsky and Kelly at Loyola University for a forum with Women Employed, the Women’s Business Development Center and other related groups to discuss creating more jobs for women.¶ Obama flies here Wednesday for two major fund-raising events to help the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee, the House political operation. The tab ranges from $1,000 for a ticket to $50,000 for those who can “bundle” donations from their own social, professional or political contacts.¶ The main event is at the Chicago Hilton, 720 S. Michigan. Major donors are invited to a dinner hosted by BettyLu and Paul Saltzman. BettyLu Saltzman holds an important place in Obama’s political history: She was one of the first major fund-raisers and Democratic activists who saw in him — when he was starting his political career in Chicago — a future president.¶ For the 2014 cycle, Obama so far has agreed to headline eight events for the DCCC — two of them to be held jointly with the Democratic Senate political shop.¶ Chicago will be the third stop on that commitment; Obama has appeared at DCCC events in San Francisco and New York this year.¶ House Democrats had a great year in Illinois in 2012: The 18-member delegation has 12 Democrats and six Republicans. The National Republican Congressional Committee has targeted four Illinois Democrats elected last year for defeat in 2014: Reps. Schneider, Bill Foster, William Enyart and Cheri Bustos.¶ Pelosi and the DCCC are defending those seats — and have targeted GOP Illinois freshman Rep. Rodney Davis for defeat, raising money for former Madison County Judge Ann Callis.¶ “Money raised in Illinois,” Pelosi said, “stays in Illinois.”¶ As for immigration, Pelosi is optimistic that obstacles that may loom large now can be bridged — after the House and Senate pass their own bills and the two chambers come together to reconcile the different versions.¶ In predicting August passage, Pelosi said support “may be not by everybody, but by enough.”

#### Immigration reform will pass – spirit of bipartisanship resolves remaining obstacles

Dallas News 5/24/13 (“Editorial: Bipartisan progress on immigration reform”, <http://www.dallasnews.com/opinion/editorials/20130524-editorial-bipartisan-progress-on-immigration-reform.ece>, CMR)

Immigration reform is making its way slowly, deliberately, sometimes painfully — almost surprisingly civilly — through the U.S. Senate. Last week, the Senate Judiciary Committee passed Senate Bill 744 on a 13-5 bipartisan vote. Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid said he will bring it to a vote of the full Senate in June.¶ It could be the most sweeping immigration reform in two decades. Just as significant as what it does for immigration is what it might do for governance, bipartisanship and civility on Capitol Hill. The bill, drafted by a “Gang of Eight” that included four Republicans and four Democrats, was shepherded by fully half the gang — Republican Sens. Lindsey Graham of South Carolina and Jeff Flake of Arizona and Democratic Sens. Chuck Schumer of New York and Dick Durbin of Illinois.¶ For five days and through 300 proposed amendments (fully 200 of which were actually debated), the four fended off efforts, intentional and unintentional, to submarine the bill. Not even the committee chairman, Democratic Sen. Patrick Leahy of Vermont, was immune. He wanted to include a provision that would have allowed same-sex couples to have the same immigration rights as heterosexual couples. Seeing it as a deal-breaker, Democrats joined Republicans in defeating the amendment.¶ Similarly, poison pill amendments by Texas’ own Ted Cruz were voted down on a bipartisan basis. One of the GOP senator’s amendments would have stripped the path to citizenship; another could have banned U.S. citizens from receiving welfare benefits if they’d ever entered the country illegally.¶ Overall, we applaud the Senate’s bipartisan efforts — a refreshing example of collaboration over conflagration. This newspaper is disappointed, though, that once again Texas’ senators weren’t part of those efforts. Cruz and Sen. John Cornyn cast two of just five votes against the immigration bill. By distancing themselves from the bipartisan compromise, they show a lack of leadership on an issue of vital importance to our state.¶ The day after the Judiciary Committee pushed the Senate bill forward, the House Committee on the Judiciary held its own immigration hearing. With no bill before it the hearing — titled “S. 744 and the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986: Lessons Learned or Mistakes Repeated?” — did more to amplify conflicts than resolve differences. The House seems to know what it doesn’t like (Senate Bill 744) but hasn’t a clue about what it does (an as-yet-undetermined House bill).¶ We urge both chambers to get on with the business of crafting bipartisan immigration reform. The country and our state desperately need a fix for the dysfunction that passes as our current immigration system.

#### Will pass – but bipartisan consensus is fragile

Pittsburgh Post-Gazette 5/27/13 (“On the move: Immigration reform gets a bipartisan boost at last”, <http://www.post-gazette.com/stories/opinion/editorials/on-the-move-immigration-reform-gets-a-bipartisan-boost-at-last-689264/>, CMR)

Just when Congress was giving the impression that the best it could do was investigate administration scandals, the Senate Judiciary Committee voted 13-5 Tuesday to advance a bipartisan bill on immigration reform, the first real action in a generation.¶ No issue has been more contentious. To his credit, former President George W. Bush proposed legislation that made humanitarian and economic sense, only to see it shot down by xenophobic figures in his own Republican Party. It took the re-election of President Barack Obama with the help of aroused Hispanic voters to bring more sage counsel that makes a deal possible.¶ The problem remains as it was -- more than 11 million immigrants in the country illegally. The need too is the same, only a little more urgent -- to regularize these shadow dwellers so that they can live normal lives, pay taxes and generally contribute to American society. And the solution too hasn't changed -- a path to legal status that does not reward illegal behavior and at the same time beefs up border security.¶ After five days and 301 amendments offered, the Border Security, Economic Opportunity and Immigration Modernization Act (S 744) does pretty much meet this challenge, although, as with many products of the political sausage machine, its parts will not be to the taste of everybody.¶ It would apply to those who arrived in the United States before Dec. 31, 2011; have maintained continuous physical presence here; and have remained out of serious trouble with law enforcement. After paying a $500 fine, those immigrants would be granted provisional immigrant status lasting six years, renewable for another $500.¶ It would take a decade for such an immigrant to become eligible for a green card if he or she met other conditions, including being up to date on taxes. The immigrant would also have to pay a $1,000 fine and wait another three years to apply for citizenship.¶ While cries of "Amnesty!" may not be stilled, this is decidedly lowercase amnesty. The legislation has sections laying out a "Comprehensive Southern Border Security Strategy" with more border patrol guards and the use of state National Guard troops if needed.¶ One of the last obstacles was agreement on a compromise allowing more visas for highly skilled foreign workers, which would benefit high-tech firms in places such as Pittsburgh. But the whole package almost unraveled when Sen. Patrick Leahy, D-Vermont, sought to give same-sex spouses the same rights as heterosexual couples under immigration law -- but backed down after pressure from Republicans and Democrats.¶ This was a final reminder that the consensus is fragile. The bill's fate in the full Senate is uncertain, and then there's the fractious Republican-led House. But at least immigration reform is moving again. If it does not pass, that will be its own scandal.

### Will Pass – AT: Citizenship/House

#### Their authors overstate opposition – it can pass without House extremists

Bernstein 5/27 (Jonathon, “The basic math of immigration reform in the House”, 2013, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/plum-line/wp/2013/05/27/the-basic-math-of-immigration-reform-in-the-house/>, CMR)

Be careful of immigration bill analyses that give heavy weight to the strongest opponents of what they call “amnesty.”¶ A Reuters story that got a fair amount of attention this past weekend does just that. Prospects for an immigration bill passing the House are indeed hard to report on, but the key here isn’t what House extremists want. Their votes aren’t in play anyway.¶ Look at the math. As Reuters notes, Republicans currently have a 233-201 edge in the House.¶ Can Republicans pass any immigration bill without Democratic support? That would be the case if they attempt to pass a slimmed-down bill without any path to citizenship. Republicans have been claiming they can do that, but I still think it’s unlikely. Such a bill would probably get very few Democratic votes — perhaps none at all. Meanwhile, if the bill were generous at all toward immigrants it would almost certainly lose those Republican members who oppose immigration reform of any kind; if it was harsh toward immigrants it would presumably lose moderates and those conservatives who believe that support for immigration is the proper conservative position. Either way, it’s hard to see them getting to 218 with only Republicans.¶ On the other hand, legislation with a path to citizenship would have support from the bulk of the Democrats and need only a relatively small group of Republicans to join them. Judging from the Senate — where three of the eight Republicans on the Judiciary Committee already voted for a comprehensive bill — finding 20 or 30 Republicans to vote yes shouldn’t be too hard.

#### Citizenship is only a matter of logistics now – not insurmountable

Johnson 5/30

[Fawn, Immigration correspondent for the National Journal, “Will Obama Immigration Plan Make History?” National Journal, 5/30/13, <http://www.nationaljournal.com/thenextamerica/immigration/will-obama-immigration-plan-make-history-20130128>]

There are three main hurdles to passing an immigration bill—citizenship, guest-workers, and House Republicans. Any one of them could scuttle the prospects of passage, but all are surmountable.¶ Citizenship. A bizarre shift occurred in the last year when Rubio emerged onto the national scene and begged fellow conservatives to speak more positively about immigration. The sparring that used to be about “amnesty,” or legalizing illegal immigrants, is now about granting them citizenship. Rubio and former House Speaker Newt Gingrich are among the conservatives who have protested any law that gives illegal immigrants their own method of becoming citizens.¶ That’s fine, say White House officials and congressional Democrats. They aren’t asking for a special path to citizenship. They just want it to be possible for non-criminal undocumented immigrants to live legally in the United States and use regular methods to become citizens within a reasonable amount of time. “Reasonable” is subject to negotiation—10 years? 20 years? No one disputes that the illegal immigrants need to be “at the back of the line.” The negotiation is basically a matter of logistics unless Republicans refuse to allow any way for illegal immigrants to become citizens. Then it’s over.

## Links

### Link – Generic – Partisanship

#### Unique link – major shifts in policy towards Latin America cause partisan battles

Whitehead & Nolte 12 (Laurence Whitehead, senior research fellow in politics at Nuffield College, Oxford, and Detlef Nolte, acting president of the GIGA, director of the GIGA Institute of Latin American Studies, professor of political science at the University of Hamburg, Number 6, 2012, <http://www.giga-hamburg.de/dl/download.php?d=/content/publikationen/pdf/gf_international_1206.pdf>, CMR)

US–Latin America relations are routinely managed by multiple bureaucratic agencies, which can act quite autonomously and are often not coordinated via a common ¶ strategy. Obama’s Latin America policy has frequently been hampered by political ¶ polarization and partisan divisions in Congress. „ The intermestic dimension of US–Latin American relations has complicated foreign ¶ policy, because a more self-confident and autonomous majority in Latin America ¶ has sometimes sought a policy shift with regard to highly sensitive topics, such as ¶ drugs, immigration and Cuba.¶ „ One issue area where some would criticize the Obama administration is its slowness ¶ in improving relations with Brazil or placing Brazil on par with, for example, India.¶ „ It is unlikely that Latin America’s modest ranking in US foreign policy will increase ¶ or that Washington’s priorities will shift much after the November 2012 elections.

#### Plan ensures partisan fights

Roett 10 – director of the Latin American Studies program at the Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies (Riordian, “What Do the U.S. Election Results Mean for Latin America?”, 11/8, <http://www.thedialogue.org/page.cfm?pageID=32&pubID=2505>, CMR)

A: Riordan Roett, director of the Latin American Studies program at the Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies: "While the president's re-election is welcome in general terms, it is difficult to imagine Latin America will receive greater attention in the next four years. Congress remains deeply divided. The administration's foreign policy priorities will continue to focus on China, the Middle East and the ongoing fiscal challenges. Given the strong turnout by the Latino community, one area that should receive priority is continued immigration reform, but it is the third rail for the Republican majority in the House. In general, the democratic governments of the region will welcome the president's election without great expectation for major policy initiatives. The populist regimes will continue to denounce any democratically elected administration. The deadlock over Cuba will continue unless there is a dramatic leadership shift to a new generation. The major policy initiative that would be welcome in the region is on drug policy, but that issue will remain taboo."

### Link – Generic – Unconditionally

#### Open engagement is dead-on-arrival – guarantees huge fights

Cohen 13 (Roger, Columnist with NYT for over 20 years, “Diplomacy Is Dead”, Jan 21, <http://www.nytimes.com/2013/01/22/opinion/global/roger-cohen-diplomacy-is-dead.html?_r=1&>, CMR)

DIPLOMACY is dead.¶ Effective diplomacy — the kind that produced Nixon’s breakthrough with China, an end to the Cold War on American terms, or the Dayton peace accord in Bosnia — requires patience, persistence, empathy, discretion, boldness and a willingness to talk to the enemy.¶ This is an age of impatience, changeableness, palaver, small-mindedness and an unwillingness to talk to bad guys. Human rights are in fashion, a good thing of course, but the space for realist statesmanship of the kind that produced the Bosnian peace in 1995 has diminished. The late Richard Holbrooke’s realpolitik was not for the squeamish.¶ There are other reasons for diplomacy’s demise. The United States has lost its dominant position without any other nation rising to take its place. The result is nobody’s world. It is a place where America acts as a cautious boss, alternately encouraging others to take the lead and worrying about loss of authority. Syria has been an unedifying lesson in the course of crisis when diplomacy is dead. Algeria shows how the dead pile up when talking is dismissed as a waste of time.¶ Violence, of the kind diplomacy once resolved, has shifted. As William Luers, a former ambassador to Venezuela and the director of The Iran Project, said in an e-mail, it occurs “less between states and more dealing with terrorists.” One result is that “the military and the C.I.A. have been in the driver’s seat in dealing with governments throughout the Middle East and in state to state (Pakistan, Afghanistan, Iraq) relations.” The role of professional diplomats is squeezed.¶ Indeed the very word “diplomacy” has become unfashionable on Capitol Hill, where its wimpy associations — trade-offs, compromise, pliancy, concessions and the like — are shunned by representatives who these days prefer beating the post-9/11 drums of confrontation, toughness and inflexibility: All of which may sound good but often get you nowhere (or into long, intractable wars) at great cost.¶ Stephen Heintz, president of the Rockefeller Brothers Fund, wrote in an e-mail that, “When domestic politics devolve into polarization and paralysis the impact on diplomatic possibility becomes inordinately constraining.” He cited Cuba and Iran as examples of this; I would add Israel-Palestine. These critical foreign policy issues are viewed less as diplomatic challenges than potential sources of domestic political capital.¶ So when I asked myself what I hoped Barack Obama’s second term would inaugurate, my answer was a new era of diplomacy. It is not too late for the president to earn that Nobel Peace Prize.¶ Of course diplomats do many worthy things around the world, and even in the first term there were a couple of significant shifts — in Burma where patient U.S. diplomacy has produced an opening, and in the yo-yoing new Egypt where U.S. engagement with the Muslim Brotherhood was important and long overdue (and raised the question of when America would do the same with the Brotherhood’s offshoot, Hamas.)¶ But Obama has not had a big breakthrough. America’s diplomatic doldrums are approaching their 20th year.

### Link – Generic – Political Capital

#### Substantial changes in engagement drain political capital

Oppenheimer 5/9 – Latin- America correspondent for the Miami Herald (Andres, “Andres Oppenheimer: Boost ties with Latin America”, 2013, <http://www.fresnobee.com/2013/05/09/3293617/andres-oppenheimer-boost-ties.html#storylink=cpy>, CMR)

I've read with great attention President Barack Obama's article in The Miami Herald earlier this week on how to improve U.S. relations with Latin America. It was pretty disappointing.¶ The article, headlined "Improving our Partnership" and published after Obama's return from a trip to Mexico and Costa Rica, says that "this is a moment of great promise for our hemisphere" and is full of feel-good talk about the future of the Americas.¶ But, sadly, it showed the absence of any U.S. plans to drastically expand trade ties with Latin America -- like the Obama administration has done with Asia and Europe -- or any sign that, in his second term, Obama will pay greater attention to this hemisphere.¶ Before we get into what Obama should do, let's take a quick look at the facts. In his article, Obama stated that about 40% of U.S. exports are currently going to Latin America, and that these exports are growing at a faster pace than U.S. shipments to the rest of the world.¶ Obama also celebrated that the U.S. Congress is finally close to approving comprehensive immigration reform. While that's a U.S. domestic issue, it would have a positive economic impact on Mexico and Central America, since millions of newly legalized immigrants would be able to visit their native countries, and most likely would be sending more money to their families back home.¶ But here are some of the facts that Obama failed to mention in his article:¶ U.S. total trade with Latin America has actually fallen as a percentage of our total trade over the past decade. While 39% of the nation's overall trade was with the Western Hemisphere in 2000, that percentage fell to 38% in 2012, according to U.S. Department of Commerce data.¶ Despite Obama's May 23, 2008, campaign promise to launch "a new alliance of the Americas," he has not started any major hemispheric free-trade initiative. By comparison, every recent U.S. president had started -- or at least tried to start -- a hemisphere-wide trade deal.¶ Obama has launched the Trans-Pacific Partnership free trade talks with mostly Asian countries, and a similar Trans-Atlantic Partnership free-trade negotiation with the 27-member European Union, but has not announced any plans for a Trans-American Partnership.¶ Granted, he has helped ratify free trade deals with Colombia and Panama, which had been signed by his predecessor. And, sure, the Trans-Pacific Partnership plan includes a few Latin American countries, such as Mexico, Peru and Chile, but they are a minority within the proposed new bloc.¶ In his May 2 trip to Mexico, Obama failed to meet Mexico's request to be included in the U.S.-proposed Trans-Atlantic partnership free-trade talks with the European Union. The Mexican governments had asked that Mexico and Canada be included in the Trans-Atlantic Partnership plan so that the proposed deal could become a North American-European Union deal. But the White House response was not yet.¶ Despite Obama's 2011 announcement of a plan to increase to 100,000 the number of Latin -American students in U.S. colleges and to 100,000 the number of U.S. students in Latin-American universities -- his most ambitious initiative for the region -- progress on the project has been slow.¶ The plan calls for significant private-sector funding, but Obama has invested little time or political capital in it. Fund-raising has been left in charge of the State Department, whose boss -- Secretary of State John Kerry -- has shown scant interest in Latin America.¶ Kerry did not travel with Obama to Mexico and Costa Rica last week, and his April 18 remark at a congressional hearing about Latin America being "our backyard" had the rare effect of antagonizing friends and foes alike in the region.¶ My opinion: As regular readers of this column know well, I much prefer Obama over his Republican critics on most issues. But I find it unfortunate that, as Obama's recent trade initiatives with Asia and Europe show, he looks East and West, but very little toward the South. Neither he, nor Kerry, nor any Cabinet-level official is focused on the region.¶ Perhaps it's too late to expect any changes. But the least Obama could do is get personally involved in the projects he has already launched. For instance, he should pick up the phone and ask CEO's of top multinationals to chip in funds for his plan to raise student exchanges with Latin America to 100,000 in both directions. If Obama doesn't get personally involved, not even that will happen.

#### Significant changes require political capital – Obama’s first term proves

Whitehead & Nolte 12 (Laurence Whitehead, senior research fellow in politics at Nuffield College, Oxford, and Detlef Nolte, acting president of the GIGA, director of the GIGA Institute of Latin American Studies, professor of political science at the University of Hamburg, Number 6, 2012, <http://www.giga-hamburg.de/dl/download.php?d=/content/publikationen/pdf/gf_international_1206.pdf>, CMR)

A key example of this was the coup against ¶ President Zelaya in Honduras, when Obama sided within the Organization of American States ¶ (OAS) with the Latin American countries against ¶ the new Honduran government but some Republican senators had their own foreign policy agenda. The latter supported the new Honduran government and blocked the confirmation in the Senate of the US ambassador to Brazil and of the assistant secretary of state for the Western Hemisphere. In Foreign Affairs, Christopher Sabatini (2012) commentated sourly, “This absurdity – ¶ blocking for nine months the appointment of a regional assistant secretary of state and an ambassador to the region’s most important player (and the ¶ world’s seventh-largest economy) over a minor ¶ ideological spat regarding a tiny country – shows ¶ the lack of seriousness of the workings of the U.S.¶ Congress in general. But it also shows how unseriously Latin America is taken in particular and ¶ what sorts of issues are considered important.” ¶ This hijacking of Latin America policy by Republican senators obliged the administration to ¶ function with “carryover” appointments from its ¶ predecessor. Fortunately, the end of the previous¶ administration had seen a considerable improvement in the caliber of appointments, so the transition from Bush to Obama was less disruptive than ¶ it might have been. However, this also meant there ¶ was little scope for conspicuous innovation; or, as ¶ Leslie H. Gelb (2012) wrote: “Even with America’s ¶ own difficulties and other international priorities, ¶ the Southern Hemisphere has commanded shockingly little time from the White House. […] At the ¶ Cartagena summit 2012, Obama was slammed for ¶ his failure to roll up his sleeves on either the Cuban embargo or drugs. The most interest Americans showed in the region came when Secret Service officers were found to be cavorting with prostitutes.” ¶ The new focus of US policy toward the region ¶ was on promoting economic and social opportunity, ensuring citizen security, strengthening effective democratic institutions, and securing a cleanenergy future. Naim (2011) has criticized this ¶ agenda as being better suited to an economic development agency and not the State Department. ¶ It has allowed US diplomats to avoid tackling real ¶ and politically explosive issues. A little more political realism is necessary, because “development ¶ does not mean the end of politics” and because US ¶ policymakers need a reminder “that twenty firstcentury Latin America has its own, autonomous ¶ power dynamics” (Sabatini 2012).¶ Whether through lack of presidential attention or as a reflection of Obama’s own outlook, ¶ the result after four years is that positive results ¶ appear to be lacking. Washington has been “reactive” rather than “proactive” as issues have arisen. Problems certainly have arisen, of course: the ¶ drug war in Mexico escalated; Haiti’s fragile institutions were devastated by a huge natural disaster; the Honduran political class united to oust ¶ a constitutionally elected president; the Paraguayan president Lugo was deposed by an impeachment, and the new Paraguayan government was ¶ suspended from UNASUR and Mercosur. Washington’s responses can be characterized as improvised and lacking a sense of strategic direction.

#### Plan consumes Obama’s focus for domestic priorities

Whitehead & Nolte 12 (Laurence Whitehead, senior research fellow in politics at Nuffield College, Oxford, and Detlef Nolte, acting president of the GIGA, director of the GIGA Institute of Latin American Studies, professor of political science at the University of Hamburg, Number 6, 2012, <http://www.giga-hamburg.de/dl/download.php?d=/content/publikationen/pdf/gf_international_1206.pdf>, CMR)

Explanations for the Low-Key Latin America ¶ Policy¶ While the overall assessment of the administration’s Latin America policy could obviously be ¶ elaborated further, the broad pattern is rather ¶ clear. It may thus be more useful to consider how ¶ this low-key outcome can be explained. Since the ¶ results of the 6 November 2012 US election remain ¶ very much in doubt at the time of writing, there ¶ is limited scope for predicting how US relations ¶ with the Americas may unfold under the next administration. Even so, an understanding of the¶ factors that have constrained Obama’s team from ¶ fulfilling initial hopes in the first term should shed ¶ some light on future prospects as well.¶ Latin America has clearly ranked low in the ¶ administration’s policy priorities, and in all probability it will continue to do so for the next few ¶ years as well. Domestic and economic challenges are likely to outweigh most foreign policy concerns, and other parts of the world are likely to demand whatever attention the administration can ¶ spare for international affairs (except those with a ¶ very direct linkage to internal policy issues or domestic partisan divides). This is especially true as ¶ regards the focus of the White House. ¶

#### Latin America policy drains political capital – crowds-out other issues

Rozental 10 – member of the Advisor board, president of Rozental & Asociados in Mexico City and senior fellow at the Brookings Institution (Andres, “What Do the U.S. Election Results Mean for Latin America?”, 11/8, <http://www.thedialogue.org/page.cfm?pageID=32&pubID=2505>, CMR)

A: Andrés Rozental, member of the Advisor board, president of Rozental & Asociados in Mexico City and senior fellow at the Brookings Institution: "The results of the U.S. congressional elections can only be sobering news for Latin America in general, and Mexico in particular. With a political and foreign policy agenda in Washington already crowded with issues unrelated to our region, it would appear that the hemisphere will slip even further down on the list of priorities for both the Obama administration and Congress. The change of control in the House probably means that even if he really wanted to move the immigration and gun control agenda forward, President Barack Obama won't have the political capital needed to counter newly elected right-wing Republicans and Tea Party representatives who generally oppose comprehensive immigration reform or any limitations on Second Amendment rights to buy and own all types of weapons, many of which find their way to the drug cartels in Mexico and beyond. Although some analysts have forecast an increased foreign policy interest by the White House after the Nov. 2 elections, any such change will most probably focus on Afghanistan, India-Pakistan relations, Iran and the Middle East peace process, not on the immediate neighborhood. Congress has already reduced the amount of assistance under Plan Mérida to Mexico, Central America and the Caribbean, which was meant to materialize the 'shared responsibility' that the United States has rhetorically assumed for the war on drugs since Obama was elected two years ago. Nothing on his or the immediate congressional agenda would indicate today that relations with Latin America might substantially change during the remaining biennium of his first term."

### Link – Cuba

#### Plan causes huge fights and requires major expenditure of political capital

LeoGrande 12 – Dean at American University, School of Public Affairs (William M, “Fresh Start for a Stale Policy: Can Obama Break the Stalemate in U.S.-Cuban Relations?”, December, <http://www.american.edu/clals/upload/LeoGrande-Fresh-Start.pdf>, CMR)

Much will depend on who makes up Obama's new foreign policy team, especially at the¶ Department of State. John Kerry has been a strong advocate of a more open policy toward Cuba,¶ and worked behind the scenes with the State Department and USAID to clean up the "democracy¶ promotion" program targeting Cuba, as a way to win the release of Alan Gross. A new secretary¶ is likely to bring new assistant secretaries, providing an opportunity to revitalize the Bureau of¶ Western Hemisphere Affairs, which has been thoroughly cowed by congressional hardliners. But¶ even with new players in place, does Cuba rise to the level of importance that would justify a¶ major new initiative and the bruising battle with conservatives on the Hill? Major policy changes¶ that require a significant expenditure of political capital rarely happen unless the urgency of the¶ problem forces policymakers to take action.

#### Plan is massively controversial

Sullivan 12 – Coordinator, Specialist in Latin America Affairs, (Mark P, “Latin America and the Caribbean: ¶ U.S. Policy and Key Issues for Congress ¶ in 2012”, Feb 14, <http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/R42360.pdf>, CMR)

As in the previous Congress, legislative and oversight attention to Latin America and the ¶ Caribbean during the 112th Congress is focusing on the continued increase in drug traffickingrelated violence in Mexico and U.S. assistance to Mexico under the Mérida Initiative; efforts to ¶ help Central American and Caribbean countries contend with drug trafficking and violent crime; ¶ as well as continued counternarcotics and security support to Colombia, which still faces threats ¶ from armed actors. The earthquake that devastated Port-au-Prince in January 2010, combined ¶ with a cholera outbreak in the fall of 2010, has continued to focus congressional attention on the ¶ enormous task of disaster recovery and reconstruction in Haiti. As in past years, debate over U.S. ¶ sanctions on Cuba, particularly restrictions on travel and remittances, has remained a contentious ¶ issue with ongoing congressional debate over how to support change in one of the world’s last ¶ remaining communist nations. Latin American nations, especially Mexico, which remains the ¶ leading source country of both legal permanent residents and unauthorized immigrants in the ¶ United States, have been disappointed by what they see as a lack of effort in Congress on ¶ comprehensive immigration reform

#### Plan is a massive gamble – drains political capital

Piccone 3/18/13 – Senior Fellow and Deputy Director, Foreign Policy (Ted, “Time to Bet on Cuba”, <http://www.brookings.edu/research/opinions/2013/03/18-cuba-piccone>, CMR)

Cuba’s efforts to “update” its socialist system through a series of economic reforms just got more complicated. The death of Venezuela’s Hugo Chávez, its principal benefactor, could seriously disrupt what is already a precarious process of maintaining top-down political control while liberalizing elements of the economy. Raúl Castro’s announcement that he will step down in five years and the emergence of younger leaders born after the 1959 revolution add further uncertainty to the island’s future.¶ These new circumstances offer President Obama a rare opportunity to turn the page of history from an outdated Cold War approach to Cuba to a new era of constructive engagement. In his second term in office, he should place a big bet by investing political capital in defrosting relations, an approach that will advance U.S. interests in a stable, prosperous and democratic Cuba.

#### Plan causes huge fights and drains political capital

Padgett 10 (Tim, “Will the White House Fight to End the Cuba Travel Ban?”, Aug 23, <http://www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,2013820,00.html#ixzz2TTN7a100>, CMR)

Proponents of doing just that insist there's more consensus than ever in the U.S. to ditch the Cuba embargo and its travel ban, which, after almost 50 years, have utterly failed to dislodge the Castro regime. Opening Cuba to Americans, they believe, will do more to stimulate democratization there than isolating it has. Even a majority of Cuban Americans now agree.¶ Still, for all the good vibes the bill's backers feel from the White House right now, some note warily that Obama has been loath to spend political capital in Cuba, or the rest of Latin America for that matter. Critics, for example, point to his decision last year to stop applying pressure against coup leaders in Honduras, who'd ousted a leftist President, when conservative Republicans in Congress objected.¶ Embargo supporters, including Cuban-American Senator Robert Menendez of New Jersey, a Democrat, are already blasting Obama's plans to relax Cuba travel. "This is not the time to ease the pressure on the Castro regime," Menendez said this month, insisting it will only give the brothers "a much needed infusion of dollars that will only extend their reign of oppression." As a result, says one congressional aide who asked not to be identified, when it comes time for the White House to give the bill more full-throated support, "there's a fear they may just decide that the fight's not worth it."

#### Expanded engagement with Cuba drains political capital

Lobe 8 (Jim, “Obama to Seek Global Re-engagement, But How Much?”, 11-5-2008, <http://ipsnorthamerica.net/news.php?idnews=1823>, CMR)

On the one hand, Obama has repeatedly stressed the importance of multilateralism and diplomatic re-engagement with the world, including long-time U.S. adversaries such as Iran, Cuba, and North Korea, as a contrast to the unilateralist and militarised approach of the incumbent, President George W. Bush.¶ On the other hand, most of his advisers are veterans of the administration of President Bill Clinton whose own brand of liberal interventionism -- including the circumvention of the United Nations in the Balkans, Sudan, and Iraq and reluctance to press Israel to make key concessions in negotiations with its Arab neighbours -- and notion that the U.S. was the 'indispensable nation' helped lay the foundation for the eight years that followed.¶ 'There are lots of Clinton re-treads,' noted Stephen Clemons, who heads the American Strategy Programme at the New America Foundation (NAF). He pointed to the reported offer to Rep. Rahm Emanuel, a former senior Clinton aide, to serve as Obama's White House Chief of Staff as one of many hints that a 'Clinton-3' administration may be in the offing.¶ As the biracial son of a Kenyan father, who spent a formative part of his childhood in Indonesia and the rest in multi-cultural Hawaii, Obama will clearly present a far different image of the United States to the rest of the world than his immediate predecessor, or any other, for that matter. Aside from his background and physical appearance, his eloquence, equanimity under fire, and intellectual acuity and curiosity will also mark a striking contrast to Bush.¶ 'The fact that he presents a very different face of America is very important, because our political capital around the world has been so very badly depleted over the last eight years,' according to Raj Menon, who teaches international relations at Lehigh University.¶ But that image, as well the foreign policy commitments he made during the campaign -- assuming that he holds to them -- may not be sufficient to ensure the kind of sweeping change in course that much of the world and many voters who cast their ballots for him here expect.¶ Obama will almost certainly make good within a relatively short time on his promises to close the Guantanamo detention facility, rejoin global efforts to curb greenhouse gas emissions responsible for global warming, and open direct dialogues with Syria and Iran, that will cheer Democrats and Washington's European allies. ¶ But, despite Democratic gains in Congress, he may be less inclined to expend political capital on more controversial issues that will require substantial bipartisan support, such as ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty or the Rome Protocol for the International Criminal Court and amending the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) to strengthen labour rights and environmental provisions.

### Link – Mexico

#### Engaging Mexico drains PC

Farnsworth 12 – VP of the Council of the Americas and Americas Society (Eric, “The United States and Mexico: The Path Forward”, Nov 30, <http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/security/news/2012/11/30/46430/the-united-states-and-mexico-the-path-forward/>, CMR)

The election of Enrique Peña Nieto and the re-election of President Obama mean that the U.S.-Mexican relationship has a unique opportunity to grow closer and bring numerous benefits to both sides of the border. To fully appreciate this unique opportunity, both sides must invest political capital and be prepared to engage domestic public opinion when it comes to explaining why our countries are united by much more than a fence.

#### Real changes require PC – failed rhetorical commitments prove

Corcoran 9 (Patrick, “Shift in Tone Not Enough for U.S.-Mexico Relations”, April 16, <http://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/3618/shift-in-tone-not-enough-for-u-s-mexico-relations>, CMR)

But while the shift in tone is laudable, the impact of rhetoric alone will be limited in both duration and depth. Unfortunately, while Obama's team has reinforced cooperative security measures already in place to help Mexico battle against drug cartels, it has remained unwilling to commit to more fundamental changes in U.S. policy. Among such possible transformations to the bilateral status quo, two U.S. legislative initiatives stand out for the impact they might have on the drug war in Mexico. ¶ First, the Obama administration should pursue a new ban on assault weapons, much like the one that expired in 2004, but without the loopholes that allowed slightly modified machine guns to qualify as legal. Since Mexico is already overrun with weapons, such a ban wouldn't drive violence down overnight, and the larger criminal organizations would still be able to find willing suppliers elsewhere. However, a strengthened ban would force drug gangs to divert a larger proportion of their profits to weapons purchases, which would make it harder for smaller groups to stockpile arsenals. It would also eventually reduce the number of weapons in the country, making Mexico less prone to outbreaks of warfare between criminal gangs. However, when asked about a new ban last month on Face the Nation, Obama demurred.¶ Second, the Obama administration should seek the legalization of marijuana, which remains the most profitable source of revenue for Mexican smugglers. Polls show that close to half of the U.S. public favors the move, which would have a greater direct impact on the profitability of Mexico's drug gangs than any other single action. A growing chorus of mainstream analysts, including Time's Joe Klein and the Washington Post's Eugene Robinson, has also called for the regulated, legal sale of cannabis in recent weeks. ¶ Yet, when questioned about the possibility of legalizing marijuana at his recent online town hall meeting, Obama -- who has himself admitted to having smoked marijuana -- poked fun at those interested in the issue before summarily dismissing it. The context of the War on Drugs, which demonizes all discussions of legalization, might make such a reaction good politics. But it remains poor policy. ¶ In other realms, Obama has been similarly timid. He has been unwilling to expend political capital to renew a program that would allow Mexican trucks to traverse U.S. roads, much to the dismay of Mexican exporters and NAFTA supporters. More significantly, while Obama has ratcheted up his rhetoric on immigration reform, it remains at best the third-highest priority on his domestic agenda. ¶ All of this means that despite the wave of Mexican enthusiasm for the new U.S. government and the tone it has struck, the bilateral relationship won't differ fundamentally from that under former presidents George W. Bush and Bill Clinton. While Obama and his administration deserve credit for reappropriating the terms of the bilateral conversation, his administration shouldn't be surprised if Mexico soon loses its infatuation with attractive rhetoric wrapped around the same old problems.

### Link – Mexico – Border Coop

#### Current US border-security strategy defers to Mexico – engagement risks opening up huge fights due to encroachments from Obama and Nieto

Fox 5/3/13 (“Obama, Peña Nieto Talk Shift In Security Cooperation”, <http://latino.foxnews.com/latino/politics/2013/05/03/obama-pena-nieto-talk-shift-in-security-cooperation/>, CMR)

But being careful not to intrude on the southern neighbor's sovereignty, Obama noted that Mexicans have the right to determine how best to tackle the violence that has plagued their country. He spoke during a press conference Thursday with Mexican President Enrique Peña Nieto.¶ Since taking office in December, Peña Nieto has moved to end the widespread access that U.S. security agencies have had in Mexico to tackle the violence that affects both sides of the border. It's a departure from the strategy employed by his predecessor, Felipe Calderon, which was praised by the U.S. but reviled by many Mexicans.¶ "I agreed to continue our close cooperation on security, even as the nature of that cooperation will evolve," Obama said during a joint news conference at Mexico's grand National Palace. "It is obviously up to the Mexican people to determine their security structures and how it engages with the other nations — including the United States."¶ Peña Nieto also downplayed the notion that the new, more centralized arrangement would damage its security partnership with the United States. He said Obama agreed during their private meeting earlier in the day to "cooperate on the basis of mutual respect" to promote an efficient and effective strategy.¶ Obama arrived in Mexico Thursday afternoon for a three-day trip that includes a stop in Costa Rica on Friday. Domestic issues followed the president south of the border, with Obama facing questions in his exchange with reporters about the potential escalation of the U.S. role in Syria, a controversy over contraception access for teenage girls, and the delicate debate on Capitol Hill on an immigration overhaul.¶ The latter issue is being closely watched in Mexico, given the large number of Mexicans who have emigrated to the U.S. both legally and illegally. More than half of the 11 million people in the U.S. illegally are Mexican, according to the Pew Research Center.¶ For Obama, the immigration debate is rife with potential political pitfalls. While he views an overhaul of the nation's patchwork immigration laws as a legacy-building issue, he's been forced to keep a low-profile role in the debate to avoid scaring off wary Republicans.¶ In an effort to court those GOP lawmakers, the draft bill being debated on Capitol Hill focuses heavily on securing the border with Mexico, and makes doing so a pre-condition for a pathway to citizenship for those in the U.S. illegally. But Florida Republican Sen. Marco Rubio, one of the bill's architects, said Thursday that unless the border security measures are made even tougher, the legislation will face tough odds not only in the GOP-controlled House but also in the Democratic-led Senate.¶ The president acknowledged there were some areas along the 2,000-mile border between the U.S. and Mexico where security needs to be tightened. But he gently chided Rubio and other Republicans for putting up obstacles that would derail final legislation.¶ "I suspect that the final legislation will not contain everything I want. It won't contain everything that Republican leaders want, either," Obama said. He added that "what I'm not going to do is to go along with something where we're looking for an excuse not to do it as opposed to a way to do it."¶ Despite the intense interest in the immigration debate among Mexicans, Peña Nieto carefully avoided injecting himself in the issue. While he commended the U.S. for tackling the challenge, he said the congressional debate "is a domestic affair."¶ The new Mexican leader was purposely seeking to avoid the perceived missteps of former Mexican President Vicente Fox, who irked conservatives in the U.S. by lobbying for an immigration overhaul in 2001.¶ Peña Nieto's election brought Mexico's Institutional Revolutionary Party, or PRI, back to power after a decade on the sidelines. The security changes are emblematic of the party's preference for centralized political and bureaucratic control.¶ The arrangement means all contact for U.S. law enforcement will now go through a "single door," according to Mexico's federal Interior Ministry, the agency that controls security and domestic policy. Under the previous policy, FBI, CIA, DEA and Homeland Security had direct access to units of Mexico's Federal Police, army and navy. ¶ U.S. agents worked side by side with those Mexican units in the fight against drug cartels, including the U.S.-backed strategy of killing or arresting top kingpins.¶ Obama lauded his Mexican counterpart for launching bold reforms during his first months in office, not only on security but also the economy. Both leaders have said they want to refocus the U.S.-Mexico relationship on trade and the economy, not the drug wars and immigration issues that have dominated the partnership in recent years.

#### No link turns – Politically charged debate crowds-out perceived benefits

Stratfor 5/2/13 (“Evolving U.S.-Mexico Relations and Obama's Visit”, <http://www.stratfor.com/analysis/evolving-us-mexico-relations-and-obamas-visit>, CMR)

Security Cooperation and Centralization¶ Pena Nieto's predecessor, the National Action Party's Felipe Calderon, focused heavily on Mexico's security challenges and oversaw the sustained military offensive against criminal organizations throughout the country. Pena Nieto has yet to elaborate much on his plans to address the security issues, but he has emphasized the need to combat street violence and kidnappings, while playing down the importance of combating drug trafficking -- a U.S. priority.¶ But ahead of Obama's visit, certain details have emerged indicating that the Pena Nieto administration intends to change the nature of intelligence cooperation between the United States and Mexico. Until now, the two countries' various law enforcement and intelligence agencies have been able to interact directly, but Mexico's interior ministry will begin overseeing all intelligence collaboration.¶ This centralization effort has not been isolated to cooperation with the United States. The Mexican Interior Ministry has also taken charge of the federal police, and Pena Nieto intends to eventually create a national gendarmarie under the interior secretariat in order to fill the role in the drug wars currently played by the Mexican military with a security body better equipped with law enforcement training.¶ Thus, the extent and manner to which this centralization will affect security cooperation with the United States is unclear. But the changes are primarily designed to give Mexico greater control over the intelligence process involved in combating the country's violent gangs. The intention is not to block U.S. collaboration and assistance, but rather to reform existing structures.¶ Domestic Issues, Bilateral Implications¶ While Mexico reorients its internal focus to structural changes that its leaders hope will lay foundations for economic development, the country could also be affected by domestic issues under debate in the United States. For years, Mexico has been pressing the United States to enact stricter gun laws. Though a prominent gun control bill failed in the U.S. Senate on April 17, the issue will likely re-emerge later in 2013, and at least some gun control measures currently enjoy broad popular support. Meanwhile, demographic changes in the United States are driving a debate about immigration reform that, if implemented, would require collaboration with Mexico, many of whose citizens would seek to legalize their residential status in the United States.¶ Though the passage of these reforms will similarly be determined solely by U.S. domestic political factors, their success would be a significant boon for bilateral relations with Mexico. Indeed, for Obama and Pena Nieto, the effects each feel of the other's policy decisions will be magnified by the unique demographic, geographic and economic ties binding their countries. Yet, the domestic environment and political calculations in each country will ultimately shape the effects of this period of political change.¶ The U.S. political decision-making process is largely isolated from international influence, and the Pena Nieto administration likewise appears to be consolidating key policy areas under Mexican control at the expense of U.S. influence. Still, Mexico's steady emergence as an economic power in North America sets the stage for a bilateral relationship much more heavily focused on opportunities for economic cooperation.

### Link UQ

#### No major changes Obama’s second term

Whitefield 11/7/12 (Mimi, and Tim Johnson, “Will Latin America become a higher priority during second Obama term?”, <http://www.miamiherald.com/2012/11/07/v-fullstory/3086849/will-latin-america-become-a-higher.html>, CMR)

But, in general, regional expectations for meaningful change in U.S. Latin American and Caribbean policy during Obama’s second term were muted.¶ The campaigns of both Obama and Republican challenger Mitt Romney “proved that Latin America is not a priority for the United States,’’ said Simon Pachano, a political science professor at the Latin American Faculty for Social Sciences in Ecuador. “Latin America existed when they were looking for Hispanic votes, but it wasn’t present in their foreign policy proposals.”¶ Anthony Bryan, a senior fellow at the Institute of International Relations at the University of the West Indies, isn’t expecting “dramatic changes” either.¶ “President Obama will probably have more time to spend on foreign policy but I am not sure the Caribbean is high on the list of places that require attention,’’ he said.¶ There was an acknowledgment that Obama has big issues to deal with at home — job creation, tax code reforms, the deficit and bridging party divides — while hot-button international issues, such as an imploding Syria, troop withdrawal in Afghanistan, Iran’s potential nuclear weapons capability and the Chinese economy, will compete for attention .

#### Election politics prove – no major changes

Hakim 11/8/12 (Peter, member of the Advisor board and president emeritus of the Inter-American Dialogue, “What Will Obama's Second Term Mean for Latin America?”, <http://www.thedialogue.org/page.cfm?pageID=32&pubID=3135>, CMR)

Q: Barack Obama was re-elected president of the United States on Tuesday. What is his vision for foreign policy and how does Latin America fit into his plans? How will Latin American leaders and their citizens react to the election results? What role did Latinos in the United States play in the election and what does that mean for U.S. policy changes on issues such as immigration, drugs and Cuba? ¶ A: Peter Hakim, member of the Advisor board and president emeritus of the Inter-American Dialogue: "Any speculation about Obama's second term has to come mainly from his first-term performance. The campaign was about the candidates and their biographies—not about issues. Nothing suggests Congress will be more productive. The House remains virtually unchanged. The Senate will be more divisive still as most remaining moderate Republicans and Democrats resigned or lost their seats. We will know soon whether compromise is possible when the lame-duck Congress returns next week, and begins discussion of the fiscal cliff embroglio. The best guess is that Congress will find a way, not to resolve the problem, but to defer its consequences. The election results focused attention on immigration policy, which both Republicans and Democrats may be motivated to address. President Obama's declared intention to address immigration was surely reinforced by the huge Latino vote. Many of the Republicans who blocked previous immigration initiatives will resist again. But some recognize their party may become irrelevant unless they take seriously the Latino and black constituencies that accounted for more than 40 percent of Obama's total. U.S. immigration reform would be a welcome change in most of Latin America, particularly in Mexico, Central America and the Caribbean. Obama may seek to pursue further openings to Cuba—but these will be limited unless the Cuban government shows a willingness to reciprocate with new human rights measures or political changes. Drug policy is not high on the U.S. agenda, but the approval in Colorado and Washington of ballot initiatives to legalize marijuana use may spark wider discussion on drug issues. But Mitt Romney offered the most significant policy proposal for Latin America, when called for more intensive U.S. efforts to pursue multiplying economic opportunities in the region."

### AT: Link Turns

#### Link turns are hype – plan guarantees partisanship

Whitehead & Nolte 12 (Laurence Whitehead, senior research fellow in politics at Nuffield College, Oxford, and Detlef Nolte, acting president of the GIGA, director of the GIGA Institute of Latin American Studies, professor of political science at the University of Hamburg, Number 6, 2012, <http://www.giga-hamburg.de/dl/download.php?d=/content/publikationen/pdf/gf_international_1206.pdf>, CMR)

Modest Achievements, Lost Opportunities ¶ While acknowledging the domestic constraints ¶ on the administration, many observers and analysts still hold a critical view on US–Latin America policy during the Obama presidency. Indeed, ¶ some ask whether there has been a foreign policy ¶ for Latin America at all. A 2011 article in the Americas Quarterly by Moisés Naim is illustrative: “U.S. ¶ policy toward Latin America is lethargic, unimaginative and surprisingly irrelevant […] The fact ¶ that Latin America does not figure in the calculations or conversations of top U.S. decision makers does not preclude some of them from giving ¶ speeches about U.S. policy towards the region that ¶ are as disconnected from reality as those given by ¶ Fidel Castro in Cuba.” One contributing factor is ¶ that foreign policy and Latin America policy became the victims of partisan political polarization ¶ and ideology-driven foreign policy initiatives in ¶ Congress.

#### Zero link turns – lack of perceived benefits

Whitehead & Nolte 12 (Laurence Whitehead, senior research fellow in politics at Nuffield College, Oxford, and Detlef Nolte, acting president of the GIGA, director of the GIGA Institute of Latin American Studies, professor of political science at the University of Hamburg, Number 6, 2012, <http://www.giga-hamburg.de/dl/download.php?d=/content/publikationen/pdf/gf_international_1206.pdf>, CMR)

A fair assessment of President Obama’s Latin ¶ America record needs to recognize that the region ¶ is not central in US foreign policy. Candidates do ¶ not expect to win elections with topics related to ¶ Latin America, but they know they could lose elections with topics like illegal migration, drug trafficking, organized crime, or weakness in the face ¶ of anti-American stances. So while it is correct that ¶ there are many so-called intermestic topics linking the US with Latin America, most of these topics have a negative connotation. To make things ¶ even more complicated, in some of these areas ¶ Latin American countries are now demanding a ¶ policy shift on the part of the US government, as ¶ a report from the Inter-American Dialogue from ¶ April 2012 states: “The US position on these troublesome issues – immigration, drug policy, and ¶ Cuba – has set Washington against the consensus ¶ view of the hemisphere’s other 34 governments. ¶ These issues stand as obstacles to further cooperation in the Americas. The United States and the ¶ nations of Latin America and the Caribbean need ¶ to resolve them in order to build more productive partnerships.” For the moment it is quite difficult to foresee major progress with regard to any ¶ of these topics in the near future given the apparent distribution of US electoral preferences in the ¶ 6 November contest.

### Politics Link Turns Case

#### The link alone turns case – partisan infighting ensures the plan becomes a bureaucratic nightmare

Whitehead & Nolte 12 (Laurence Whitehead, senior research fellow in politics at Nuffield College, Oxford, and Detlef Nolte, acting president of the GIGA, director of the GIGA Institute of Latin American Studies, professor of political science at the University of Hamburg, Number 6, 2012, <http://www.giga-hamburg.de/dl/download.php?d=/content/publikationen/pdf/gf_international_1206.pdf>, CMR)

Who Decides on the United States’ Latin ¶ America Policy?¶ Latin Americans familiar with vertical and often ¶ highly personalized systems of presidential governance often assume that the US political system ¶ shares these features. It can be difficult to accept ¶ that despite polite diplomatic discourse, in reality their country’s priorities and appeals do not really register within the White House. In practice, ¶ a lower level of bureaucratic politics determines ¶ the great bulk of the policy interactions between ¶ the USA and its neighbors. Of course, there is always an appearance of presidential coordination ¶ through the White House and the National Security Council, but in practice these central agencies ¶ cannot monitor effectively on all fronts and tend ¶ to focus on no more than a limited set of urgent ¶ priorities. The majority of Latin American politicians more or less understand the role of certain ¶ agencies – the Pentagon, the CIA, and the Drug ¶ Enforcement Administration – although they often assume that their policies are more centrally controlled than is generally the case. However, there is less understanding of the huge variety ¶ of distinct and relatively autonomous Washington ¶ institutions that can impinge on foreign policymaking, and still less understanding of how difficult coordination between them can be. ¶ When President Carter prepared an agenda for ¶ a high-level summit with Mexico’s president Lopez Portillo in 1979, he appointed a special ambassador, the experienced Democratic veteran Robert Strauss, to help him. This was an ambassador ¶ from the White House, not to Mexico but to all the ¶ other Washington agencies with entrenched policy interests in Mexico. The task was to work out ¶ what the US Department of Agriculture, the Bureau of Mines, the Congressional Subcommittee on Irrigation, and the state authorities in Texas, among others, would ask for and were prepared to offer in the course of an overall bargaining session with the Mexican government. Similar coordination problems arise with other Latin ¶ American countries, or groups of countries, and ¶ if anything the partisan gridlock in contemporary ¶ Washington makes these difficulties even more intractable now than in the past.

### Internal Link – Bipart Key

#### Internal link – The plan poisons the well of cooperation --- prevents passage of future initiatives

Wallsten 12/8 (Peter Wallsten and Zachary A. Goldfarb, 12/8/2012, “Obama’s second-term agenda will be shadowed by budget woes,” <http://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/obamas-second-term-agenda-will-be-shadowed-by-budget-woes/2012/12/08/ea97e956-4091-11e2-ae43-cf491b837f7b_story.html>)

One House GOP leadership aide said Obama would be unwise “if he comes in here and poisons the well by trying to break as many Republicans as he can. By nature of how politics works, you’re going to see a lot less cooperation going forward.”¶ Rep. Peter Roskam (R-Ill.), a top Boehner lieutenant, hinted at that sentiment among House Republicans last week when he told reporters Obama had “an unbelievable opportunity to be a transformational president” by bringing the parties together for a debt deal. “Or he can dissolve into zero-sum game politics, where he wins and . . . other people lose.”

#### Immigration passage is contingent on continued bipartisan cooperation

Fabian, 1/30 (Jordan, 1/30/2013, “Obama Confident Immigration Reform Passes This Year,” <http://abcnews.go.com/ABC_Univision/Politics/president-obama-confident-immigration-reform-passes-year/story?id=18358660>))

President Barack Obama expressed confidence on Wednesday that he would sign comprehensive immigration reform into law by the end of this year.¶ In an interview with Univision's Maria Elena Salinas, Obama explained that significant details of a bill still must be worked out by lawmakers, including the structure of a pathway to citizenship for many of the 11 million undocumented immigrants. But Obama said that the progress made by a bipartisan group of lawmakers in the Senate has given him hope that a deal can get done.¶See Also: Transcript: President Obama's Interview¶ When asked by Salinas if we will have immigration reform by the end of the year, Obama said, "I believe so."¶ "You can tell our audience, 'Sí, se puede?'" Salinas asked.¶ "Sí, se puede," Obama responded.¶ Later in the interview, Obama said that he hopes a bill could be passed as early as this summer.¶ But cognizant of deep divisions a topic like immigration has sewn in the past, Obama said that's contingent on bipartisan negotiations continuing to proceed well.¶ "The only way this is going to get done is if the Republicans continue to work with Democrats in Congress, in both chambers, to get a bill to my desk," he said. "And I'm going to keep on pushing as hard as I can. I believe that the mood is right."¶ Maria Elena Salinas talks to President Obama after his Las Vegas announcement on immigration reform.¶ Univision¶ Maria Elena Salinas talks to President Obama... View Full Size¶ Although the president threatened to introduce his own bill if negotiations in Congress stall during his speech in Las Vegas, Nevada, on Tuesday, he said he is content to let lawmakers hash out the details among themselves for the time being.¶ "If they are on a path as they have already said, where they want to get a bill done by March, then I think that's a reasonable timeline and I think we can get that done. I'm not going to lay down a particular date because I want to give them a little room to debate," he said. "If it slips a week, that's one thing. If it starts slipping three months, that's a problem."¶ The president's principles and the Senate's principles on immigration broadly align with one another, but there are still thorny issues that could spark a division between Obama and Republicans, such as the pathway to citizenship.¶ The Senate's path to citizenship would allow many undocumented immigrants to obtain legal status immediately upon passage of the law. But their ability to then seek legal permanent residency would be contingent upon the U.S.-Mexico border being deemed secure. Sen. Marco Rubio (R-Fla.), a member of the bipartisan "Gang of Eight" on immigration, has been particularly vocal in stating that border security is a precondition for gaining legal permanent residence, and then citizenship.

#### Bipartisan cooperation key to passage

Epstein, 1/30 (Jennifer, 1/30/2013, “President Obama: Get immigration reform done by summer,” <http://www.politico.com/story/2013/01/obama-immigration-reform-by-summer-86968.html>))

President Barack Obama hopes to see Congress to pass a major immigration reform bill by early summer, he said Wednesday, as he blamed resistance on Capitol Hill for the failure to get the reforms done during his first term.

“I’m not a king,” he told Telemundo, as he followed up on his Tuesday trip to Las Vegas to unveil his proposals for reform with interviews with Spanish-language television networks. “You know, my job as the head of the executive branch ultimately is to carry out the law. And, you know, when it comes to enforcement of our immigration laws we’ve got some discretion. We can prioritize what we do. But we can’t simply ignore the law.”

Obama took executive action last year to change the federal enforcement of immigration laws, helping young adults avoid deportation if serving in the military or pursuing higher education.

He said he would push for legislation to make further changes. Though he’s left it to Congress to work out the details, the president said the White House has already written its own that he’ll send for an up or down vote if lawmakers are too slow.

“I’ve got a bill drafted. We’ve got language,” he said.

But he said that he hoped Congress would not force things to come to that.

“I think this is something we should be able to get done certainly this year and I’d like to see if we could get it done sooner, in the first half of the year if possible,” Obama said.

In an interview with Univision also taped Wednesday, Obama said he’s confident that immigration reform will pass before the end of the year. “Si, se puede,” he said at the prompting of interviewer Maria Elena Salinas, repurposing the slogan used by farm workers that was then turned into the English-language rallying cry for his 2008 campaign as “Yes we can.”

What’s still holding back action “is not so much technical as it’s political,” Obama said in his interview with Telemundo, which was conducted by Jose Diaz-Balart. “It’s a matter of Republicans and Democrats coming together and finding a meeting of the minds and then making the case. I’m hopeful that this can get done, and I don’t think that it should take many, many months.”

Diaz-Balart said he’d checked with the offices of Sen. Marco Rubio (R-Fla.) and other Republicans supportive of the immigration reform proposal put out by a bipartisan group of eight senators on Monday, and that none of them reported having heard from Obama on the issue.

Obama said he was open to talking to anyone, but indicated that the outreach had to come from Capitol Hill. “I am happy to meet with anybody, anytime, anywhere to make sure that this thing happens,” he said. “You know, the truth is oftentimes what happens is members of Congress prefer meeting among themselves to build trust between Democrats and Republicans there.”

“They want assistance from us but sometimes they want it through back channels,” he added. “And, you know, if they want a public meeting, if they want private meetings, anything that is necessary to move this thing forward, we’re happy to.”

Some immigrants-rights groups have urged Obama to put a moratorium on all deportations until Congress works through its current reform push. But Obama said it’s his responsibility to continue overseeing the enforcement of existing federal laws.

“There are still going to be stories that are heartbreaking with respect to deportations until we get comprehensive immigration reform,” he said in his interview with Univision. “That’s one of the reasons I think it’s so important for us to go ahead and get this action done.”

### AT: XO Solves

#### Executive action fails – deters employers and immigrants

Cox and Rodriguez ‘9 Adam & cristina Adam B. Cox is a Professor of Law, University of Chicago Law School. Cristina M. Rodríguez is a Professor of Law, New York University School of Law. “The President and Immigration Law” The Yale Law Journal 119:458 2009

For example, in situations in which the Executive would prefer to admit immigrants with lawful status, it is largely powerless to do so. Their lawful admission would be inconsistent with the admissions criteria established by Congress. One instance in which the Executive might prefer access to the lawful path is when potential immigrants are unable or unwilling to bear the risks associated with unlawful entry. Whereas many low-skilled migrants with few other options bear these risks, high-skilled immigrants often will not. Migration to the United States may be less valuable to the latter, because they have more migration options, or because they have economic prospects at home sufficient to support a family and live a good life. What is more, employers of high-skilled immigrants may be much less likely to take the risk of flouting the immigration laws than employers of lower skilled labor. For high-skilled migrants, then, the delegation of ex post screening authority substitutes poorly for ex ante authority.

#### No executive action – Obama knows the risks

Hamilton 3/26 (Keegan, “How Obama Could (but Probably Won't) Stop Deporting Illegal Immigrants Today”, http://thehill.com/blogs/congress-blog/homeland-security/277799-dont-wait-for-president-obama-to-act-on-immigration-reform#ixzz2OrYPaWXd , CMR)

With immigration-reform legislation inching toward the president's desk, it's unlikely he'll waste political capital by halting deportations or even reducing the immigrant detainee population, despite the budgetary considerations. The prospect of doing anything that might alienate Republicans, especially with a compromise so close, alarms activists like Tamar Jacoby, president of ImmigrationWorks USA, an advocacy group comprised largely of small-business owners.¶ "We have a Congress for a reason," Jacoby says. "To fix anything permanently you need to have legislation, and in order for that to happen it has to be bipartisan. My worst nightmare is the president thinking, 'I don't need bipartisan legislation. Why share credit with Republicans? I can just go on and do this myself.' I think that's a disastrous political strategy."¶ If the current congressional push for immigration reform were to fail, however, a presidential pardon for undocumented immigrants with no criminal history might be Obama's last ditch alternative to prosecutorial discretion. Rather than scaling back on detentions, Obama could instantly--and permanently-- legalize millions of illegal immigrants. Beck, the Georgia law scholar, notes that the Constitution empowers the president to "grant reprieves and pardons for offences against the United States, except in cases of impeachment."¶ The question, he says, is "whether coming into the country in violation of the immigration laws or overstaying a visa could be deemed an 'offense against the United States.'" But the president has broad powers of pardon, and it seems that Obama could exercise those powers here. Beck cites United States v. Klein, an 1871 Supreme Court case that involved a presidential pardon issued during the Civil War to confederates who rejoined the union and took an oath of loyalty.¶ But even if executive-branch lawyers could put forth a legal rationale for the move, there are political reasons why Obama would likely be reluctant to make it. Although potentially cementing loyalty from a generation of Latinos, a mass pardon would likely be deeply unpopular with moderates and liberals who put faith in the legislative process, and would be considered downright treasonous by many Republicans. Obama could face Congressional censure or perhaps even impeachment if he had any time remaining in office, and the backlash against Democrats could make the Tea Party-fueled, Obamacare-inspired shellacking of 2010 look mild.¶ "If in December 2016 Obama says, 'Unconditional pardon to everybody in the country illegally,' that would totally dismantle Democratic Party governance for a generation," Mayer says. "I don't think he wants that to be his legacy."

### AT: Winners Win

#### Even legislative victories burn capital and harden opposition to the president

Eberly 13 --- coordinator of Public Policy Studies and assistant professor in the Department of Political Science at St. Mary's College of Maryland (Todd, “The presidential power trap; Barack Obama is discovering that modern presidents have difficulty amassing political capital, which hinders their ability to enact a robust agenda,” 1/21, <http://articles.baltimoresun.com/2013-01-21/news/bs-ed-political-capital-20130121_1_political-system-party-support-public-opinion>, CMR)

Barack Obama's election in 2008 seemed to signal a change. Mr. Obama's popular vote majority was the largest for any president since 1988, and he was the first Democrat to clear the 50 percent mark since Lyndon Johnson. The president initially enjoyed strong public approval and, with a Democratic Congress, was able to produce an impressive string of legislative accomplishments during his first year and early into his second, capped by enactment of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act. But with each legislative battle and success, his political capital waned. His impressive successes with Congress in 2009 and 2010 were accompanied by a shift in the public mood against him, evident in the rise of the tea party movement, the collapse in his approval rating, and the large GOP gains in the 2010 elections, which brought a return to divided government.

**Winners-win theory is wrong --- Obama’s first term proves**

**Calmes 12** (Jackie, International Herald Tribune, “Obama looks to budget talks as an opportunity to take control of agenda; News Analysis,” 11/13/2012, Factiva, CMR)

Whether Mr. Obama succeeds will reveal much about what kind of president he intends to be in his second term. Beyond the specifics of any accord, perhaps **the bigger question hanging over the negotiations is whether** Mr. **Obama will go to his second inaugural in January with an achievement that starts to rewrite the unflattering leadership narrative that**, fairly or not, **came to define his first term** for many people.¶ **That story line, stoked by Republicans but shared by some Democrats, holds that** Mr. **Obama is too passive and deferential to Congress**, a legislative naïf who does little to nurture personal relationships with potential allies — in short, not a particularly strong leader. Even as voters re-elected Mr. Obama, those who said in surveys afterward that strong leadership was the most important quality for a president overwhelmingly chose Mr. Romney.¶ George C. **Edwards III, a leading scholar of the presidency at Texas A&M** University who is currently teaching at Oxford University, **dismissed such criticisms as shallow and generally wrong**. Yet Mr. **Edwards**, whose book on Mr. Obama’s presidency is titled ‘‘Overreach,’’ **said, ‘‘He didn’t understand the limits of what he could do.’’**¶ **‘‘They thought they could continuously create opportunities and they would succeed, and then there would be more success and more success, and we’d build this advancing-tide theory of legislation,’’** Mr. Edwards said. **‘‘And that was very naïve, very silly. Well, they’ve learned a lot, I think.’’**¶ **‘‘Effective leaders,’’** he added, **‘‘exploit opportunities rather than create them.’’**

**Rebuilding takes too long**

**Lashof 10** (Dan Lashof, director of the National Resource Defense Council's climate center, Ph.D. from the Energy and Resources Group at UC-Berkeley, 7-28-2010, NRDC Switchboard Blog, "Coulda, Shoulda, Woulda: Lessons from Senate Climate Fail," <http://switchboard.nrdc.org/blogs/dlashof/coulda_shoulda_woulda_lessons.html>, CMR)

Lesson 2: Political capital is not necessarily a renewable resource. Perhaps **the most fateful decision** the **Obama** administration **made** early on **was to move healthcare** reform **before energy and climate** legislation. I’m sure this seemed like a good idea at the time. **Healthcare** reform **was popular**, was seen as an issue that the public cared about on a personal level, **and** was **expected to unite Democrats** from all regions. **White House officials and Congressional leaders reassured environmentalists** with their theory **that success breeds success**. A quick victory on healthcare reform would renew Obama’s political capital, some of which had to be spent early on to push the economic stimulus bill through Congress with no Republican help. **Healthcare** reform **was** eventually enacted, **but only after an exhausting battle that** eroded public support, **drained political capital and created the Tea Party movement.** **Public support** for healthcare reform **is slowly rebounding** as some of the early benefits kick in and **people realize that the forecasted Armageddon is not happening**. **But this is occurring too slowly to rebuild Obama’s political capital** in time **to help push climate legislation across the finish line.**

### AT: No Spillover/PC Not Key

**Presidential leadership shapes the agenda**

**Kuttner 11** (Robert, Senior Fellow – Demos and Co-editor – American Prospect, “Barack Obama's Theory of Power,” The American Prospect, 5-16, <http://prospect.org/cs/articles?article=barack_obamas_theory_of_power>, CMR)

**As the political scientist** Richard **Neustadt observed** in his classic work, Presidential Power, a book that had great influence on President John F. Kennedy, **the essence of a president's power is "the power to persuade."** Because our divided constitutional system does not allow the president to lead by commanding, **presidents amass power by** making strategic choices **about when to use the latent authority of the presidency to move public and elite opinion and then use that added prestige as clout to move Congress.** In one of Neustadt's classic case studies, Harry Truman, a president widely considered a lame duck, nonetheless persuaded the broad public and a Republican Congress in 1947-1948 that the Marshall Plan was a worthy idea. As Neustadt and Burns both observed, **though an American chief executive is weak by constitutional design, a president possesses several points of leverage. He can play an effective outside game, motivating and shaping public sentiment, making clear the differences between his values and those of his opposition, and using popular support to box in his opponents and** move them in his direction**. He can complement the outside bully pulpit with a nimble inside game,** unit**ing his legislative party, bestowing or withholding benefits on opposition legislators, forcing them to take awkward votes, and using the veto. He can also enlist the support of interest groups to** pressure Congress**, and use media to validate his framing of choices. Done well, all of this** signals leadership **that often** moves the **public** agenda**.**

**PC is key and finite—Congress will link unrelated issues**

**Haftel ’11** (Yoram Z, Assist Prof, PhD @ Ohio State, “Delayed Ratification: The Domestic Fate of Bilateral Investment Treaties”, December, <http://polisci.osu.edu/faculty/athompson/pdf/Delayed_Ratification_Dec2011.pdf>, CMR)

Of course, leaders face many political obstacles that are not captured in the formal process of treaty ratification, and it is important to consider such constraints in addition to the specific hurdles governing treaty ratification. As one U.S. BIT negotiator explained, it is not just the ratification institutions that Washington takes into account in a partner, “it’s how freely the government functions.”34 Like **legislation and** other **policy initiatives**, treaty ratification **is subject to** issue-linkage **at the domestic level and often requires the expenditure of finite political capital**, **thus the executive must take into account these broader political dynamics** when advocating for a treaty. **For example**, President **Obama’s efforts to secure** Senate ratification of the new **START** treaty with Russia **were held up** by Republicans **in Congress as part of a broad political strategy, not for reasons related to** proliferation or **national security.** Partly for these reasons, and because executives may depend on legislatures and local governments to implement a treaty’s provisions, the preferences of other domestic actors matter even when they do not play a formal role in ratification. In Canada, for example, the prime minister often seeks to “build a broad base of support for international treaties”35—even though no such legal requirement exists.

### AT: No Spillover

#### Yes spillover – fights over Latin America force zero-sum tradeoffs

Whitehead & Nolte 12 (Laurence Whitehead, senior research fellow in politics at Nuffield College, Oxford, and Detlef Nolte, acting president of the GIGA, director of the GIGA Institute of Latin American Studies, professor of political science at the University of Hamburg, Number 6, 2012, <http://www.giga-hamburg.de/dl/download.php?d=/content/publikationen/pdf/gf_international_1206.pdf>, CMR)

Two years into Obama’s first term, researchers at the Brookings Institution revisited some ¶ of these ideas in light of the developments that ¶ had taken place so far (Lowenthal, Piccone, and ¶ Whitehead 2010). While the emphasis and interpretations of the various contributors differed, ¶ there was a general recognition that most of these ¶ initial hopes had been set too high. Symptomatic of this was the fact that the promise to close ¶ Guantanamo prison had not been honored, and ¶ that, after no more than the briefest of pauses, the ¶ “ALBA” group, led by President Chávez, had resumed its negative discourse. Obviously, the ¶ gravity of the economic crisis facing the incoming ¶ president had absorbed most of his energies, and ¶ in the foreign policy domain continuing and severe security challenges in Iraq, Afghanistan and ¶ elsewhere in the Muslim world had necessarily taken priority over less urgent Western Hemisphere concerns. On the domestic political front ¶ the new president had run into ferocious opposition to his healthcare reforms, and a deeply polarized internal climate had drastically reduced his ¶ room for maneuver on peripheral issues.

#### Latin America policy drains political capital – crowds-out other issues

Rozental 10 – member of the Advisor board, president of Rozental & Asociados in Mexico City and senior fellow at the Brookings Institution (Andres, “What Do the U.S. Election Results Mean for Latin America?”, 11/8, <http://www.thedialogue.org/page.cfm?pageID=32&pubID=2505>, CMR)

A: Andrés Rozental, member of the Advisor board, president of Rozental & Asociados in Mexico City and senior fellow at the Brookings Institution: "The results of the U.S. congressional elections can only be sobering news for Latin America in general, and Mexico in particular. With a political and foreign policy agenda in Washington already crowded with issues unrelated to our region, it would appear that the hemisphere will slip even further down on the list of priorities for both the Obama administration and Congress. The change of control in the House probably means that even if he really wanted to move the immigration and gun control agenda forward, President Barack Obama won't have the political capital needed to counter newly elected right-wing Republicans and Tea Party representatives who generally oppose comprehensive immigration reform or any limitations on Second Amendment rights to buy and own all types of weapons, many of which find their way to the drug cartels in Mexico and beyond. Although some analysts have forecast an increased foreign policy interest by the White House after the Nov. 2 elections, any such change will most probably focus on Afghanistan, India-Pakistan relations, Iran and the Middle East peace process, not on the immediate neighborhood. Congress has already reduced the amount of assistance under Plan Mérida to Mexico, Central America and the Caribbean, which was meant to materialize the 'shared responsibility' that the United States has rhetorically assumed for the war on drugs since Obama was elected two years ago. Nothing on his or the immediate congressional agenda would indicate today that relations with Latin America might substantially change during the remaining biennium of his first term."

## Impacts

### 1NC Economy

#### Immigration reform key to prevent economic collapse

Milller 2/7 – former two-term elected Kentucky State Treasurer, Miller held several other senior positions in state and federal government, including serving in Kentucky Governor Steve Beshear’s Cabinet as Secretary of Finance and Administration, as Deputy Chief of Staff of the U.S. Department of Energy, and as Legislative Director for Congressman Jim Cooper (Jonathon, “Why Our Economy Demands Immigration Reform”, <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/jonathanmiller/immigration-reform-economy_b_2639092.html>, CMR)

When it comes to restoring strong, long-term growth in our nation's economy, there are few solutions more practical, bi-partisan, and urgent than immigration reform.¶ Our current immigration system is rigid, outdated, and simply unable to keep up with demands of the new global marketplace. For our nation to thrive and transcend international competition in the 21st century economy, it is incumbent for us to build an immigration system that welcomes people who share our values, as well as the entrepreneurial spirit that has made our country great.¶ No one can doubt that we are a nation whose foundation was built by immigrants. But did you know that more than 40 percent of today's Fortune 500 companies were founded by an immigrant, or a child of an immigrant? Or that more than 75 percent of all the patents received by the top ten U.S. universities in 2011 had an immigrant inventor? While we celebrate our nation's first immigrants every Thanksgiving -- and while many of us cherish the stories shared by our own family members who made the pilgrimage to our shores -- we too often forget that today, and every day, recent immigrants continue to play a vital role in the American economy.¶ Unfortunately, far too often, our immigration policies drive too many foreign-born entrepreneurs and job creators away, even after we have trained them and given them degrees from American universities.¶ This is not simply a matter of compassion or human interest. This is about the very survival of our economy, way of life, and continued global leadership. We must make it easier for foreign-born, U.S.-educated students to get visas. We must create a startup visa program for entrepreneurs and innovators who want to come to our country to start businesses and hire American workers, especially when they already have U.S. investors to back their ideas. We must be doing everything we can to keep that capital in the U.S., rather than handing the next great idea over to our competitors.¶ Furthermore, with the enormous baby boomer generation set to retire, our current aging workforce simply cannot keep up with the demands. We need many more young workers, both in the high- and low-skilled areas of our economy. The U.S. government estimates that there are more than 3.5 million unfilled jobs in this country, even with high unemployment. Shortages are particularly high in industries with seasonal demands, like agriculture, landscaping, and hospitality. Many hotels and resorts across the country remain at half capacity, even during the busiest tourist seasons, simply because they cannot find enough workers to meet demands. We leave hundreds of millions of dollars in crops out in the fields because we can't hire enough workers to harvest them in time.¶ Unfortunately, our system is not structured in a way that accounts for the ebb and flow of our labor needs. We need a more flexible visa allotment system, and we need to expand the number of employment-based visas that are issued each year. Right now, only 7 percent of all green cards are distributed for employment based reasons, which is clearly far too low.¶ It is refreshing to see Congress take the initial steps to reform, and I applaud the bi-partisan Gang of Eight for taking a leadership role in these efforts and laying out sensible solutions. They have opened the door for a healthy debate. Now we need to make sure that Congress takes action and creates a more modern and reasonable immigration system for our country.¶ I will never forget the pride I felt when my wife -- the mother of our two incredible daughters -- was naturalized as a U.S. citizen. We must reform our system so that many more families can experience the joy she felt in becoming an American. And we must reform our system because their pride and joy results in a better economic climate and more job opportunity for all of our country.

**US economic collapse causes war and triggers every impact**

**O’Hanlon 12** — Kenneth G. Lieberthal, Director of the John L. Thornton China Center and Senior Fellow in Foreign Policy and Global Economy and Development at the Brookings Institution, former Professor at the University of Michigan, served as special assistant to the president for national security affairs and senior director for Asia on the National Security Council, holds a Ph.D. from Columbia University, and Michael E. O'Hanlon, Director of Research and Senior Fellow in Foreign Policy at the Brookings Institution, Visiting Lecturer at Princeton University, Adjunct Professor at Johns Hopkins University, holds a Ph.D. from Princeton University, 2012 (“The Real National Security Threat: America's Debt,” *Los Angeles Times*, July 10th, Available Online at http://www.brookings.edu/research/opinions/2012/07/10-economy-foreign-policy-lieberthal-ohanlon, Accessed 07-12-2012)

Lastly, American economic weakness **undercuts U.S. leadership abroad**. Other countries **sense our weakness** and wonder about our purport 7ed decline. If this perception becomes more widespread, and the case that we are in decline becomes more persuasive, countries will begin to **take actions that reflect their skepticism about America's future**. Allies and friends will **doubt our commitment** and may **pursue nuclear weapons** for their own security, for example; adversaries will **sense opportunity** and be **less restrained in throwing around their weight** in their own neighborhoods. The crucial Persian Gulf and Western Pacific regions will likely become **less stable**. **Major war will become more likely**.

When running for president last time, Obama eloquently articulated big foreign policy visions: healing America's breach with the Muslim world, controlling global **climate change**, dramatically curbing **global poverty** through development aid, **moving toward a world free of** **nuclear weapons**. These were, and remain, worthy if elusive goals. However, for Obama or his successor, there is now **a much more urgent big-picture issue: restoring U.S. economic strength. Nothing else is really possible if that fundamental prerequisite to effective foreign policy is not reestablished**.

### 2NC Economy

#### Comprehensive reform key to US economic recovery

Garcia and Fitz 12/10 (Ann Garcia is a Research and Policy Associate for the Center for American Progress. Marshall Fitz is the Director of Immigration Policy at the Center, “Progressive Immigration Policies Will Strengthen the American Economy”, 2012, <http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/immigration/news/2012/12/10/47406/progressive-immigration-policies-will-strengthen-the-american-economy/>, CR)

Immigrants have been a critical part of the American economy since the founding of our nation, but they are even more important today as we look to the future of our economic recovery and our economy. While Congress debates the economic strategy to restore our nation’s fiscal health, an opportunity is on the horizon that would maximize the human capital and talent of the nearly 40 million immigrants who call America home.¶ In order to reap the rewards of this talented and diverse labor pool, we must develop a legislative solution to fix our nation’s broken immigration system. Immigration reform that creates a pathway to earned legal status—and eventually to citizenship—for the undocumented immigrants living in our country while at the same time updating our legal immigration system will unleash the potential of immigrant workers and students to work, innovate, and add hundreds of billions of dollars to the U.S. economy.¶ Let’s review how progressive immigration policies can help make this happen.¶ Legalizing our nation’s undocumented immigrants¶ Legalizing the 11 million undocumented immigrants in the United States would add a cumulative $1.5 trillion to the U.S. gross domestic product—the largest measure of economic growth—over 10 years. That’s because immigration reform that puts all workers on a level playing field would create a virtuous cycle in which legal status and labor rights exert upward pressure on the wages of both American and immigrant workers. Higher wages and even better jobs would translate into increased consumer purchasing power, which would benefit the U.S. economy as a whole.¶ The federal government would accrue $4.5 billion to $5.4 billion in additional net tax revenue over just three years if the 11 million undocumented immigrants were legalized.¶ The national advantage of legalizing the undocumented immigrants is obvious in the previous figures, but gains are also evident at the state level. The state of Texas, for example, would see a $4.1 billion gain in tax revenue and the creation of 193,000 new jobs if its approximately 1.6 million undocumented immigrants were legalized.¶ States that have passed stringent immigration measures in an effort to curb the number of undocumented immigrants living in the state have hurt some of their key industries, which are held back due to inadequate access to qualified workers. A farmer in Alabama, where the state legislature passed the anti-immigration law H.B. 56 in 2011, for example, estimated that he lost up to $300,000 in produce in 2011 because the undocumented farmworkers who had skillfully picked tomatoes from his vines in years prior had been forced to flee the state.¶ With nearly half of agricultural workers, 17 percent of construction workers, and 12 percent of food preparation workers nationwide lacking legal immigration status, it isn’t hard to see why a legalization program would benefit a wide range of industries. Business owners—from farmers to hotel chain owners—benefit from reliable and skilled laborers. A legalization program would ensure that they have them.¶ Passing the DREAM Act¶ Passing the DREAM Act—legislation that proposes to create a roadmap to citizenship for immigrants who came to the United States as children—would put 2.1 million young people on a pathway to legal status, adding $329 billion to the American economy over the next two decades.¶ Legal status and the pursuit of higher education would create an aggregate 19 percent increase in earnings for DREAMers—young people who would benefit from passage of the DREAM Act—by 2030. The ripple effects of these increased wages would create $181 billion in induced economic impact, 1.4 million new jobs, and $10 billion in increased federal revenue.¶ Reforming the high-skilled immigration system¶ Creating a 21st century high-skilled immigration system—a system that accepts highly qualified immigrant workers when there is a demand that cannot be filled by American workers—would stimulate innovation, enhance competitiveness, and help cultivate a flexible, highly skilled U.S. workforce, while protecting American workers from globalization’s destabilizing effects.¶ The United States has always been and continues to be the nation where creative and talented individuals from around the world can come to realize their dreams, and our economy has significantly benefited from their innovation. In 2011 immigrant entrepreneurs were responsible for more than one in four new U.S. businesses, and immigrant businesses employ 1 in every 10 people working for private companies. Immigrants and their children founded forty percent of Fortune 500 companies. These Fortune 500 companies collectively generated $4.2 trillion in revenue in 2010—more than the GDP of every country in the world except the United States, China, and Japan. Reforms that enhance legal immigration channels for high-skilled immigrants and entrepreneurs while protecting American workers and placing all high-skilled workers on a level playing field will promote economic growth, innovation, and workforce stability in the United States.¶ Our economy has benefited enormously from the talented immigrants who come here to study. Upon graduation, however, immigrant students face the tough choice between returning home and finding an employer to sponsor their entry into a visa lottery that may allow them to stay and work. Reforming the high-skilled immigration system would allow us to reap the benefits of having subsidized the education and training of these future job creators as immigrant students graduate and go on to work at our nation’s companies, contributing directly and immediately to our nation’s competitiveness in the global market.¶ Significant reform of the high-skilled immigration system would benefit certain industries that require high-skilled workers, such as the high-tech manufacturing and information technology industries. Immigrants make up 23 percent of the labor force in both of these industries and are more highly educated, on average, than the native-born Americans working in these industries. Still, immigrants working in science, technology, engineering, and math fields in the United States complement, rather than compete with, American workers. For every immigrant who earns an advanced degree in one of these fields at a U.S. university, 2.62 American jobs are created. By focusing on drawing human capital to our country and retaining it, Congress can help ensure that key sectors of our economy have an adequate labor pool to draw from and can boost our collective economic potential.¶ Our economy has much to gain from reforming our broken immigration system. But the biggest rewards will only be realized if Congress approaches immigration reform as an economic opportunity to be seized rather than an enforcement problem to be solved. Legislation that deals comprehensively with the issue by putting the nation’s undocumented immigrants, including DREAMers, on a path to citizenship while also reforming the high-skilled immigration system will strengthen the nation’s economy while increasing prosperity for all Americans.

#### Biggest, quickest internal link

Hinojosa-Ojeda 12 – Founding Director of the North American Integration and Development Center at the University of California, Los Angeles

(Raúl, “The Economic Benefits of Comprehensive Immigration Reform”, Cato Institute, Winter, online,

The Economic Benefits of Comprehensive¶ Immigration Reform¶ The results of our modeling suggest that comprehensive immigration¶ reform would increase U.S. GDP by at least 0.84 percent¶ per year. Using 10-year GDP projections prepared by the¶ Congressional Budget Office, this translates into a steadily increasing¶ amount of added annual GDP over the coming decade. The¶ 10-year total is at least $1.5 trillion in added GDP, which includes¶ roughly $1.2 trillion in additional consumption and $256 billion in¶ additional investment.¶ Comprehensive immigration reform brings substantial economic¶ gains even in the short run—during the first three years following¶ legalization. The real wages of newly legalized workers increase by¶ roughly $4,400 per year among those in less-skilled jobs during the¶ first three years of implementation, and $6,185 per year for those in¶ higher-skilled jobs. The higher earning power of newly legalized¶ workers translates into an increase in net personal income of $30 billion¶ to $36 billion, which would generate $4.5 to $5.4 billion in additional¶ net tax revenue nationally, enough to support 750,000 to¶ 900,000 new jobs.¶ Ultimately, only the federal government can resolve the status of¶ the undocumented. But for the purposes of our analysis, we examine¶ what would happen on a state and county level if local workforces¶ were fully legalized through comprehensive immigration reform.¶ In California, which faces a $25.4 billion budget shortfall in¶ 2011–12, this scenario would lead to a $27 billion increase in labor¶ income (pre-tax salary and wage earnings) that would generate a¶ $5.3 billion boost in tax revenue for the state and add 633,000 desperately¶ needed jobs to the economy. In Los Angeles County, labor¶ income would increase $10 billion through legalization, leading to¶ $1.9 billion in additional net tax revenue and 211,000 new jobs. In¶ Arizona, the same legalization scheme would generate $5.6 billion¶ more in labor income, leading to $1.68 billion in tax revenue and an¶ additional 261,000 jobs.¶ The wages of native-born workers also increase under the comprehensive¶ immigration reform scenario because the “wage floor”¶ rises for all workers—particularly in industries where large numbers¶ of easily exploited, low-wage, unauthorized immigrants currently¶ work. Wages for native-born U.S. workers increase by roughly $162¶ per year for the less-skilled and $74 per year for the higher-skilled.¶ Under the temporary worker program scenario, wages fall for both¶ less-skilled and higher-skilled native-born U.S. workers. And under¶ the mass deportation scenario, wages for less-skilled native-born¶ workers actually rise, but only at the cost of significantly fewer jobs¶ as the economy contracts and investment declines. The cost of this¶ scheme to local economies, however, is staggering.¶ If California’s workforce were depleted by mass deportation, the¶ resulting contraction of the economy would mean a loss of $176 billion¶ in labor income and a reduction in gross product of $300 billion,¶ or 17 percent of the state economy. As a result, 3.6 million jobs would¶ be lost. Los Angeles County would be even harder hit, with the¶ $60.1 billion loss in labor income causing a 22 percent reduction in¶ the local economy and the loss of 1.2 million jobs. Arizona’s case is¶ almost as severe, with the $29.5 billion the state would lose in labor¶ income as a result of mass deportation and the $48.8 billion reduction¶ in gross product representing a 20 percent depletion of the¶ economy and the loss of 581,000 jobs.¶ The benefits of additional U.S. GDP growth under the comprehensive¶ immigration reform scenario are spread very broadly¶ throughout the U.S. economy, with virtually every sector expanding.¶ Particularly large increases occur in immigrant-heavy industries¶ such as textiles, ferrous metals, transportation equipment, electronic¶ equipment, motor vehicles and parts, nonelectric machinery and¶ equipment, capital goods, mineral products, and construction. In¶ comparison, every sector experiences significantly smaller gains¶ under the temporary worker scenario, while every sector contracts¶ under the mass deportation scenario.¶ Conclusion¶ The experience of IRCA and the results of our modeling both¶ indicate that legalizing currently unauthorized immigrants and creating¶ flexible legal limits on future immigration in the context of full¶ labor rights would raise wages, increase consumption, create jobs,¶ and generate additional tax revenue—particularly in those sectors of¶ the U.S. economy now characterized by the lowest wages. This is a¶ compelling economic reason to move away from the current “vicious¶ cycle” where enforcement-only policies perpetuate unauthorized¶ migration and exert downward pressure on already-low wages, and¶ toward a “virtuous cycle” of worker empowerment in which legal status¶ and labor rights exert upward pressure on wages.¶ Legalization of the nation’s unauthorized workers and new legal¶ limits on immigration that rise and fall with U.S. labor demand would¶ help lay the foundation for robust, just, and widespread economic¶ growth. Moving unauthorized workers out of a vulnerable underground¶ status strengthens all working families’ ability to become more¶ productive and creates higher levels of job-generating consumption,¶ thereby laying a foundation for long-term community revitalization,¶ middle-class growth, and a stronger, more equitable national economy.

### 2NC Economy – Turns Case

#### Economic decline turns the case – focus

Whitehead & Nolte 12 (Laurence Whitehead, senior research fellow in politics at Nuffield College, Oxford, and Detlef Nolte, acting president of the GIGA, director of the GIGA Institute of Latin American Studies, professor of political science at the University of Hamburg, Number 6, 2012, <http://www.giga-hamburg.de/dl/download.php?d=/content/publikationen/pdf/gf_international_1206.pdf>, CMR)

Two years into Obama’s first term, researchers at the Brookings Institution revisited some ¶ of these ideas in light of the developments that ¶ had taken place so far (Lowenthal, Piccone, and ¶ Whitehead 2010). While the emphasis and interpretations of the various contributors differed, ¶ there was a general recognition that most of these ¶ initial hopes had been set too high. Symptomatic of this was the fact that the promise to close ¶ Guantanamo prison had not been honored, and ¶ that, after no more than the briefest of pauses, the ¶ “ALBA” group, led by President Chávez, had resumed its negative discourse. Obviously, the ¶ gravity of the economic crisis facing the incoming ¶ president had absorbed most of his energies, and ¶ in the foreign policy domain continuing and severe security challenges in Iraq, Afghanistan and ¶ elsewhere in the Muslim world had necessarily taken priority over less urgent Western Hemisphere concerns. On the domestic political front ¶ the new president had run into ferocious opposition to his healthcare reforms, and a deeply polarized internal climate had drastically reduced his ¶ room for maneuver on peripheral issues.

#### Growth solves the case – pre-requisite to securing leadership and increased engagement

Whitefield 11/7/12 (Mimi, and Tim Johnson, “Will Latin America become a higher priority during second Obama term?”, <http://www.miamiherald.com/2012/11/07/v-fullstory/3086849/will-latin-america-become-a-higher.html>, CMR)

The president should concentrate on getting the U.S. economy back on track because “that is the best thing we could do for Latin America’’ in terms of spurring trade and investment, said Eric Farnsworth, vice president of the Americas Society/Council of the Americas.¶ “From a national security perspective, it’s very obvious we have to show the world we are capable of getting our house in order if we’re going to inspire confidence in America’s continuing role in the world,’’ Robert Kagan, a senior fellow at Brookings Institution, said Wednesday during a forum at the Washington think tank.

### 2NC Hegemony

#### Reform key to hegemony – biggest, quickest internal link

Kliman ’10 – visiting fellow at the Center for a New American Security [Daniel, “Immigration and American Power”, May 28, <http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2010/05/28/opinion/main6525992.shtml>] CR

President Obama’s National Security Strategy released on Thursday has launched the opening salvo in a battle to recast what immigration means to the United States. The new strategy observes that American prosperity and leadership depends on “attracting the premier human capital for our workforce.” That is, immigration equals national power. This recasting comes at a critical moment. The United States can no longer take for granted its capacity to attract and retain foreign talent. Successfully competing for the world’s best and brightest requires urgent immigration reform. American power and immigration are closely interlinked. The most dynamic sectors of the U.S. economy are heavily dependent on foreign talent. Immigrants have founded 25percent of public, venture-backed U.S. companies, including eBay, Yahoo, and Google. Between 1995 and 2005, foreigners from just two countries - China and India - accounted for almost 30 percent of all Silicon Valley startups. American leadership in science and technology also rests on the inflow of talent from abroad. As fewer and fewer U.S. citizens have chosen careers in science, foreigners have stepped in to fill the gap. One-fourth of America’s science and engineering workforce is foreign-born. In 2007, foreigners accounted for almost 50 percent of all science and engineering doctorates awarded in the United States. Immigration is not inevitably destined to remain a wellspring of American power. Historically, greater economic opportunity, superior universities, a relatively open immigration system, and a tolerant society rendered the United States an irresistible magnet for immigrants. But the world is rapidly changing, and the most talented immigrants may no longer stay. Home to the fastest growing major economies, Asia has become a region of opportunity for returnees who are highly educated or have overseas work experience. Asian governments have begun to actively court their expatriates. China, for example, uses world-class facilities, plentiful grant money, and prestigious titles to woo researchers living abroad. Whether America’s ability to cream off the best and brightest has already declined remains uncertain. Prior to the financial crisis, the “stay rates” for foreigners receiving PhDs in science and engineering increased slightly. But a 2008 survey of foreign students enrolled in U.S. higher education found that 55 percent of Indian respondents and 40 percent of Chinese respondents wanted to return home within five years. If this snapshot is predictive, then “stay rates” for these groups are set to substantially decline. The United States cannot rest on its laurels. Sustaining American power will require stepping up efforts to attract and retain foreign talent. A number of worthy proposals already exist. One would be to increase the number of H-1B visas for foreigners with critical skills. Another would be the creation of a new visa for immigrant entrepreneurs, as outlined in a Senate bill recently introduced by John Kerry and Richard Lugar. The bill would establish a visa for immigrants who raise startup funds from U.S. investors and grant them legal residence if the venture generates at least five jobs. A third would focus on foreigners in science and engineering graduate programs. Any number of measures could make the United States a more attractive long-term home for them. Hand out Green Cards with their diplomas. Automatically grant them work visas upon graduation. Or introduce a flexible visa allowing them to move between the United States and their home country for a ten-year period with an ultimate option of settling in the United States and expedited citizenship. A fourth would recognize that immigrants often return home to be closer to family. The United States could facilitate visas for family members of foreigners who work in science and technology-related industries. The overarching objective of President Obama’s National Security Strategy is to renew American power. Promoting immigration is the most immediate way to do so. Other wellsprings of American power, such as infrastructure and education, can only be moved in a positive direction over the long term. Major projects to upgrade America’s infrastructure will take years, while the returns from improving education will require a generation to realize. Although these goals should be pursued as well, renewing American power starts with welcoming foreign talent to America’s shore.

**Key to the economy and heg**

**Palomarez 3/6** – President & CEO of the United States Hispanic Chamber of Commerce (3/6/2013, Javier, “The Pent Up Entrepreneurship That Immigration Reform Would Unleash,” <http://www.forbes.com/sites/realspin/2013/03/06/the-pent-up-entrepreneurship-that-immigration-reform-would-unleash/>, CMR)

**Washington recently took a major step forward in negotiations on comprehensive immigration reform**. Tom **Donohue, President of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and** Richard **Trumka, the President of the AFL-CIO, announced a compromise for dealing with lesser-skilled workers in immigration reform**.¶ This is progress. In 2007, neither side would even come to the table to discuss their differences, so this effort sends a clear signal that both corporate America and our country’s workers understand the importance of comprehensive immigration reform to their bottom line.¶ How did this compromise come about?¶ The main difference between now and 2007 is that today the role of immigrants and their many contributions to the American economy have been central in the country’s national conversation on the issue.¶ Never before have Latinos been so central to the election of a U.S. President as in 2012. New evidence about the economic importance of immigration reform, coupled with the new political realities presented by the election, have given reform a higher likelihood of passing.¶ As the President & CEO of the country’s largest Hispanic business association, the U.S. Hispanic Chamber of Commerce (USHCC), which advocates for the interests of over 3 million Hispanic owned businesses, I have noticed that nearly every meeting I hold with corporate leaders now involves a discussion of how and when immigration reform will pass. The USHCC has long seen comprehensive immigration reform as an economic imperative, and now the wider business community seems to be sharing our approach. It is no longer a question of whether it will pass.¶ **Out of countless conversations with business leaders in virtually every sector and every state, a consensus has emerged: our broken and outdated immigration system hinders our economy’s growth and puts America’s global leadership in jeopardy.**¶ **Innovation drives the American economy, and without good ideas and skilled workers, our country won’t be able to transform industries or to lead world markets as effectively as it has done for decades.**¶Consider some figures: Immigrant-owned firms generate an estimated $775 billion in annual revenue, $125 billion in payroll and about $100 billion in income. A study conducted by the New American Economy found that over 40 percent of Fortune 500 companies were started by immigrants or children of immigrants.¶ Leading brands, like Google, Kohls, eBay, Pfizer, and AT&T, were founded by immigrants. Researchers at the Kauffman Foundation released a study late last year showing that from 2006 to 2012, one in four engineering and technology companies started in the U.S. had at least one foreign-born founder — in Silicon Valley it was almost half of new companies.¶ **There are an estimated 11 million undocumented workers currently in the U.S. Imagine what small business growth in the U.S. would look like if they were provided legal status, if they had an opportunity for citizenship. Without fear of deportation or prosecution, imagine the pent up entrepreneurship that could be unleashed.** After all, these are people who are clearly entrepreneurial in spirit to have come here and risk all in the first place.¶ Immigrants are twice as likely to start businesses as native-born Americans, and statistics show that most job growth comes from small businesses.¶ While **immigrants** are both critically-important consumers and producers, they **boost the economic well-being of native-born Americans as well**.¶ Scholars at the Brookings Institution recently described the relationship of these two groups of workers as complementary. This is because lower-skilled immigrants largely take farming and other manual, low-paid jobs that native-born workers don’t usually want.¶ For example, when Alabama passed HB 56, an immigration law in 2012 aimed at forcing self-deportation, the state lost roughly $11 billion in economic productivity as crops were left to wither and jobs were lost.¶ **Immigration reform would also** address another important angle in the debate – the need to **entice high-skilled immigrants**. Higher-skilled immigrants provide talent that high-tech companies often cannot locate domestically. High-tech leaders recently organized a nationwide “virtual march for immigration reform” to pressure policymakers to remove barriers that prevent them from recruiting the workers they need.¶ Finally, and perhaps most importantly, fixing immigration makes sound fiscal sense. Economist Raul Hinojosa-Ojeda calculated in 2010 that **comprehensive immigration reform would add $1.5 trillion to the country’s GDP over 10 years and add $66 billion in tax revenue** – enough to fully fund the Small Business Administration and the Departments of the Treasury and Commerce for over two years.¶ **As Congress continues to wring its hands and debate the issue, lawmakers must understand what both businesses and workers already know: The American economy needs comprehensive immigration reform.**

### 1NC Latin-America Relations

**Reform key to Latin American relations**

Charlene Barshefsky and James T. Hill, US-LATIN AMERICA RELATIONS: A NEW DIRECTION FOR ANEW REALITY? Council on Foreign Relations, 4--12, www.cfr.org

Some enduring problems stand squarely in the way of partnership and effective cooperation. The inability of Washington to reform its broken immigration system is a constant source of friction between the United States and nearly every other country in the Americas . Yet US officials rarely refer to immigration as a foreign policy issue . Domestic policy debates on this issue disregard the United States’ hemispheric agenda as well as the interests of other nations.

#### Solves democracy and warming

Shifter 12. [Michael, President of the Sol M. Linowitz Forum Intern-American Dialogue, "Remaking the Relationship: The United States and Latin America" Inter-American Dialogue Policy Report -- April -- www.thedialogue.org/PublicationFiles/IAD2012PolicyReportFINAL.pdf]

There are compelling reasons for the United States and Latin America to ¶ pursue more robust ties .¶Every country in the Americas would benefit from strengthened and ¶ expandedeconomic relations, with improved access to each other’s markets, investment capital, and energy resources . Even with its current economic problems, the United States’ $16-trillion economy is a vital market ¶ and source of capital (including remittances) and technology for Latin ¶ America, and it could contribute more to the region’s economic performance . For its part, Latin America’s rising economies will inevitably become¶ more and more crucial to the United States’ economic future .The United States and many nations of Latin Americaand the Caribbean ¶would also gain a great deal bymore cooperation on such global matters ¶ as climate change, nuclear non-proliferation, and democracy and human ¶ rights . With a rapidly expanding US Hispanic population of more than 50 ¶ million, the cultural and demographic integration of the United States and ¶ Latin America is proceeding at an accelerating pace, setting a firmer basis ¶ for hemispheric partnership. Despite the multiple opportunities and potential benefits, relations between ¶ the United States and Latin America remain disappointing . If new opportunities are not seized, relations will likely continue to drift apart . The longer the ¶ current situation persists, the harder it will be to reverse course and rebuild ¶ vigorous cooperation . Hemispheric affairs require urgent attention—both ¶ from the United States and from Latin America and the Caribbean

**Extinction**

Diamond ’95(Larry, Senior Fellow – Hoover Institution, Promoting Democracy in the 1990s, December, http://wwics.si.edu/subsites/ccpdc/pubs/di/1.htm)

OTHER THREATS This hardly exhausts the lists of threats to our security and well-being in the coming years and decades. In the former Yugoslavia nationalist aggression tears at the stability of Europe and could easily spread. The flow of illegal drugs intensifies through increasingly powerful international crime syndicates that have made common cause with authoritarian regimes and have utterly corrupted the institutions of tenuous, democratic ones. Nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons continue to proliferate. The very source of life on Earth, the global ecosystem, appears increasingly endangered. Most ofthesenew and unconventional threats to security are associated withor aggravated by the weakness orabsence of democracy,with its provisions for legality, accountability, popular sovereignty, and openness. LESSONS OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY The experience of this century offers important lessons.Countries that govern themselves in a trulydemocratic fashion do not go to war with one another. They do not aggress against their neighbors to aggrandize themselves or glorify their leaders. Democratic governments do not ethnically "cleanse" their own populations, and they are much less likely to face ethnic insurgency. Democracies do not sponsor terrorism against one another. They do not build weapons of mass destructionto useon or to threaten one another. Democratic countries form more reliable, open, and enduring trading partnerships. In the long run they offer better and more stable climates for investment. They are more environmentally responsible because they must answer to their own citizens, who organize to protest the destruction of their environments. They are better bets to honor international treaties since they value legal obligations and because their openness makes it much more difficult to breach agreements in secret. Precisely because, within their own borders, they respect competition, civil liberties, property rights, and the rule of law, democracies are the only reliable foundation on which a new world order of international security and prosperity can be built.

### 1NC Terrorism

#### Immigration reform decreases terror risk—multiple mechanisms

Griswold 04 (Daniel, Senior Fellow @ CATO, Federal News Service, 4/1, lexis)

MR. DANIEL GRISWOLD: Thank you, Chairman Chambliss, and members of the subcommittee for allowing the Cato Institute to testify on the pressing issue of border security and immigration reform. Since the terrorist attacks of September 11th, 2001, Congress and the administration and this subcommittee have labored to balance the need to secure our borders with our need to remain a free society, open to the world. Long time opponents of immigration seized on the attacks to argue against legalization of Mexican migration and in favor of drastic cuts in existing levels of legal immigration. But any connection between terrorism and illegal immigration from Mexico is tenuous. None of the 19 hijackers entered the country illegally or as immigrants. They all arrived in the United States with valid temporary non-immigrant visas. None of them arrived via Mexico. None of them were Mexican. Sealing our Southwestern border with a three- tiered, 2,000 mile wall patrolled by a division of U.S. troops would not have kept a single one of those terrorists out of the United States. The problem, Mr. Chairman, is not too many immigrants but insufficient control over who enters the country. Immigrants who come to the United States to work and settle are but a small subset of the tens of millions of foreign born people who enter the United States every year. In fact, on a typical day, as you know, more than one million people enter the United States legally by air, land and sea, through more than 300 ports of entry. In a typical year more than 30 million individual foreign nationals enter the United States as tourists, business travelers, students, diplomats and temporary workers. Now, of those, about 1.3 million will eventually settle here as permanent immigrant residents, some of them illegally. In other words, less than 5 percent of the foreigners who enter the United States each year intend to immigrate in any sense of the word. We could reduce immigration to zero and still not be safe from terrorists who might enter on temporary non-immigrant visas. Our focus, one might say our obsession in recent years with stifling the migration of Mexicans across our Southwest border has not served our national security interest. It has diverted resources and attention away from efforts to identify and keep out people who truly mean to do us harm. While we were guarding the back door in 2001 to make sure no Mexican immigrants entered our country illegally to work, we were neglecting the far larger barn door of temporary non-immigrant visas through which all the September 11th hijackers entered. Most members of Congress understand that willing workers from Mexico are not a threat to America's national security. In May 2002 Congress overwhelmingly approved and the president signed the Enhanced Border Security and Visa Entry Reform Act. We don't get to say this very much at Cato, but that was a good piece of legislation. The law was aimed at the right target: keeping terrorists out of the United States. It mandates a timely sharing of intelligence with the State Department and Border Control agencies and use of machine readable and tamper resistant entry documents among other commonsense reform. Notably absent from the bill were any provisions rolling back levels of legal immigration or bolstering efforts to curb illegal migration from Mexico. Indeed, legalization and regularization -- legalizing and regularizing the movement of workers across the U.S.-Mexican border would enhance our national security by bringing much of the underground labor market into the open, encouraging newly documented workers to fully cooperate with law enforcement officials, and freeing resources for border security and the war on terrorism. Real immigration reform would drain a large part of the underground swamp of smuggling and document fraud that facilitates illegal immigration. It would reduce the demand for fraudulent documents which in turn would reduce the supply available for terrorists trying to operate surreptitiously inside the United States. It would eliminate most of the human smuggling operations I believe overnight. The vast majority of Mexican workers who enter the United States have no criminal records or intentions, they would obviously prefer to enter the country in a safe, orderly, legal way through the standard ports of entry rather than putting their lives in the hands of unscrupulous smugglers. Just as importantly, legalization would encourage millions of currently undocumented workers to make themselves known to authorities by registering with the government, reducing cover for terrorists who manage to enter the country and overstay their visas. Workers with legal documents would be more inclined to cooperate with law enforcement because they wouldn't fear deportation. Immigration reform would free up enforcement and border control resources to focus on protecting the American homeland from terrorist attack. Our Department of Homeland Security, which I believe has a hiring freeze on right now, should concentrate its limited resources and personnel on tracking and hunting down terrorists instead of raiding chicken processing plants and busting janitors at discount stores. Congress should respond to the leadership shown by President Bush and reform our dysfunctional immigration system. Immigration reform would help our economy grow, it would enhance -- and it would reduce illegal immigration and it would enhance the federal government's ability to wage war on terrorism.

#### Nuclear war--retaliation

Patrick F. Speice, "Negligence and Nuclear Nonproliferation: Eliminating the Current Liability Barrier to Bilateral U.S.-Russian Nonproliferation Assistance Programs," WILLIAM & MARY LAW REVIEW v. 47, 2--06, p. 1437-1438.

Accordingly, there is a significant and ever-present risk that terrorists could acquire a nuclear device or fissile material from Russia as a result of the confluence of Russian economic decline and the end of stringent Soviet-era nuclear security measures. 39 Terrorist groups could acquire a nuclear weapon by a number of methods, including "steal[ing] one intact from the stockpile of a country possessing such weapons, or ... [being] sold or given one by [\*1438] such a country, or [buying or stealing] one from another subnational group that had obtained it in one of these ways." 40 Equally threatening, however, is the risk that terrorists will steal or purchase fissile material and construct a nuclear device on their own. Very little material is necessary to construct a highly destructive nuclear weapon. 41 Although nuclear devices are extraordinarily complex, the technical barriers to constructing a workable weapon are not significant. 42 Moreover, the sheer number of methods that could be used to deliver a nuclear device into the United States makes it incredibly likely that terrorists could successfully employ a nuclear weapon once it was built. 43 Accordingly, supply-side controls that are aimed at preventing terrorists from acquiring nuclear material in the first place are the most effective means of countering the risk of nuclear terrorism. 44 Moreover, the end of the Cold War eliminated the rationale for maintaining a large military-industrial complex in Russia, and the nuclear cities were closed. 45 This resulted in at least 35,000 nuclear scientists becoming unemployed in an economy that was collapsing. 46 Although the economy has stabilized somewhat, there [\*1439] are still at least 20,000 former scientists who are unemployed or underpaid and who are too young to retire, 47 raising the chilling prospect that these scientists will be tempted to sell their nuclear knowledge, or steal nuclear material to sell, to states or terrorist organizations with nuclear ambitions. 48 The potential consequences of the unchecked spread of nuclear knowledge and material to terrorist groups that seek to cause mass destruction in the United States are truly horrifying. A terrorist attack with a nuclear weapon would be devastating in terms of immediate human and economic losses.49 Moreover, there would be immense political pressure in the United States to discover the perpetrators and retaliate with nuclear weapons, massively increasing the number of casualties and potentially triggering a full-scale nuclear conflict

### AT: No Skilled Worker Shortage

#### Yes shortages – New immigrants key to start-ups and entrepreneurship

Wee ‘13 (Heesun, “How Lack of Immigration Reform Harms Startups, US Economy”, 1/24, 2013, <http://www.cnbc.com/id/100401598>, CMR)

As President Barack Obama begins his second term, small companies and the technology community are hoping for immigration reform to help them secure highly skilled foreign workers.¶ Overhauling U.S. immigration law has been long-awaited for years. But without political consensus on the issue, technology startups in particular have felt the pains of limited works visas. They've also absorbed the high legal fees associated with the visa process — costs that few cash-strapped upstarts can afford.¶ "I've been blown away by how much the immigration policy has been kicking us in the teeth," said Alex Salazar, chief executive and co-founder of Stormpath, a Silicon Valley startup that's been struggling to find candidates in engineering, computer science and software development. Most of his candidates are from outside the U.S., and half the recruitment conversations are about visas.¶ "In Silicon Valley it's a war for talent — an all out knuckle-drag war," Salazar said. And America's current immigration policy only slows Salazar's ability to hire specialized talent in a tech sector that's hot, competitive and only growing.¶ Frustrated by how the drawn-out visa process is hampering his 11-employee business and its grow path, Salazar posted the following note on his Facebook page: "If you want to be a great startup CEO, become an expert in U.S. immigration policy."¶ Hopes for Immigration Reform¶ Stormpath and other startups say they can't efficiently hire qualified foreign candidates because of a shortage of temporary work visas and green cards. They've been pushing for legislation that would allow more immigrants with high-tech skills to remain in the country.¶ "The demand for software developer talent is growing so much faster than our own American candidate pool is growing — regardless of why," Salazar said. "The demand is insatiable. I can't just grab someone from a regular school and give them two months of training and throw them on our projects. You have to have six to seven years of experience, computer science degrees from the top schools."¶ Immigration reform wasn't a priority during Obama's first term. But during his second inaugural address, Obama hinted at change.¶ "Our journey is not complete until we find a better way to welcome the striving, hopeful immigrants who still see America as a land of opportunity," the president said, "until bright young students and engineers are enlisted in our workforce, rather than expelled from our country."¶ Gary Shapiro, president and chief executive of the Consumer Electronics Association, has been a vocal advocate of immigration reform. The message from the White House seems to be that Obama won't agree to raising visa caps for highly skilled immigrants unless it is part of a broader reform plan, he said.¶ "When I talk to our industry members, they all say it [the lack of immigration reform] is a problem for their companies," Shapiro said. "And it's not just our industry." Biotechnology and medical fields are experiencing similar struggles to fill specialized slots, he said.¶ Shapiro argues the current immigration landscape combined with our corporate tax policy dampens American entrepreneurship. "Between immigration and the tax system, it's a very harmful strategy to economic growth and job creation in the United States," Shapiro said.¶ Shapiro and other tech leaders were disappointed when the White House and Congress failed to pass a bill late last year that would have removed random lottery slots for hard science PhDs. The bill, known as the STEM Jobs Act, would have helped keep foreign-born graduates in America. The STEM fields are science, technology, engineering and mathematics.

#### Immigration reform key to start-ups and commercialization – otherwise collapse of industries is inevitable

Moritz ’13 (Michael, Chairman at Sequoia Capital, “Immigration Reform: Stop Ejecting the Brightest Minds From America”, <http://www.linkedin.com/today/post/article/20130128153456-25760-immigration-reform-stop-ejecting-the-brightest-minds-from-america>, CMR)

Let's hope Congress does not flinch as it begins the debate about immigration reform because the future is passing through security – in the wrong direction. It leaves the United States on every departing airplane carrying a foreign born student who has graduated from an American university with an advanced degree in the sciences, technology, engineering and math. The majority of these people want to stay in the United States but because of existing immigration laws, they have no choice but to leave.¶ In Silicon Valley, which has always been blind to any attribute other than ability, everyone knows that the remarkable achievements of the foreign born have led to the formation of companies such as Google, Intel, Sun Microsystems, nVidia, Yahoo! PayPal and scores of others that are less well known. Of the last eleven early stage companies that have allied themselves with Sequoia Capital, seven have had immigrants among their founding lineup. This is not a sudden or recent phenomenon; it has been the leitmotif of our business since the 1970s. However, the number of startups would be even higher if we weren’t ejecting foreign-born students and if we welcomed their contemporaries who have been educated overseas. Today, it is impossible to satisfy Silicon Valley's appetite for engineers and scientists with people born in America.¶ The xenophobia underlying current immigration policy has three consequences for the U.S. technology industry. First, the know-how for all sorts of new companies is being expelled from America. Second, it makes it even harder to fill the job vacancies at existing U.S. based semiconductor, biotech, networking and software companies. Third, it means that University labs, which have sown the seeds for so many commercial breakthroughs of the past seventy-five years, are deprived of the young faculty members who can be counted on for bursts of inspiration and originality. In the massive global IQ competition, the United States is shooting itself in the foot.¶ Today – while the Internet has made it simple for companies to identify the most capable prospects anywhere in the world – it is harder than ever to obtain the necessary paperwork. At Stripe, a young payments company in San Francisco (where I am a Board Member), the founders are a pair of Irish brothers, the senior business executive was born in Honduras and 14 of its 23 engineers were born outside the United States. Stripe’s engineering department would be at least twice as large if we could get working papers for the programmers we are eager to hire. Unless we do something quickly, our nation’s hiring problem will get more acute as U.S. educational standards continue to decline while they improve elsewhere.

# AFF

### 2ac – no pass

#### House GOP will kill reform – don’t buy the hype on Senate momentum

Cillizza 6/25 (Chris, and Sean Sullivan, “The Senate is going to pass immigration reform. And the House doesn’t care”, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/the-fix/wp/2013/06/25/the-senate-is-going-to-pass-immigration-reform-and-the-house-doesnt-care/>, CMR)

Two things have become clear over the past 24 hours: 1. The Senate is going to pass some sort of comprehensive immigration reform bill, and 2. The House doesn’t much care. Welcome to Washington, circa 2013!¶ It’s chilly in the U.S. Capitol these days.¶ “Why should a minority of the minority in the Senate influence a majority of the majority in the House,” asked Oklahoma Republican Rep. Tom Cole. “While most Senators aren’t up for election next year, every member of the House will be on the ballot.”¶ Rewind back a few months and the idea that a vote to proceed to debate on a key border security measure would win 67 votes — as it did Monday night — would be greeted with something between disbelief and joy by immigration reform advocates.¶ But, even before the Senate voted Monday night, it was obvious that no matter what the vote looked like it would have little influence on the plans of the GOP-controlled House.¶ House Speaker John Boehner (Ohio) had told his Republican colleagues that no immigration legislation would be brought the floor if a majority of the GOP majority didn’t support it. And, anyone who has spent any time around the current Republican majority in the House — or watched as the farm bill failed last week – recognizes that the Senate immigration bill (and, perhaps, any bipartisan immigration bill) isn’t going to be backed by a majority of the Republican majority in that chamber.¶ How the Senate voted on Monday also affirms that the immigration legislation could well be dead on arrival in the House. Not a single member of the Senate GOP leadership voted for cloture. All told, 27 Republicans voted against it while 15 voted in favor of the cloture motion. (Four GOP Senators did not vote, largely due to bad weather in and around Washington Monday that delayed flights.) Those numbers provide little of the momentum or pressure that some Republicans had hoped might be foist upon the House with a strong Senate GOP vote for the bill.¶ “It doesn’t matter at all,” said one senior GOP House leadership aide about the Senate vote on immigration. “It wouldn’t be something a Republican Senate would bring to the floor. Why should a Republican House just take it up?”¶ Added another House Republican leadership staffer: “Even if the bill passes with 70-plus votes in the Senate, the path to 218 in the House is very perilous. Many Republicans are skeptical of even voting on something as simple as border security, as they feel that it provides a ‘path to Conference [committee]‘ where they are afraid an untenable compromise will emerge.”¶ During the “fiscal cliff” debate, the Senate passed a bipartisan measure with 89 votes over the opposition of only five Republicans. But over in the House, less than 40 percent of Republicans supported it, reinforcing the reality that nothing in the Senate guarantees passage in the lower chamber.¶ What Republicans in the House want, according to Cole, is a chance to pass their own bill through the normal legislative order and then try to negotiate a compromise between their version and what passes the Senate. “If that cannot be done then no bill should or will pass the House,” he said.¶ Now, it’s important to remember that the Senate vote on Monday night was simply to move ahead on one proposed part of a larger package. But it was a significant step toward a final vote on passage before Congress breaks around July 4.¶ It’s possible that votes in the Senate could shift between Monday and the final vote on the measure. (Of course, it would be strange if any of the 27 Republicans who opposed cloture then turned around and voted for the legislation.) And, it’s also possible that the House GOP leadership will change its approach between now and then.¶ Neither scenario seems likely, however. Which means that immigration reform — at least at the moment — looks to be teetering on the edge of failure.

#### Lack of border security makes the bill “dead on arrival” in the House

CBS 6/23 (“Immigration reform foes count on House to kill the bill”, <http://www.cbsnews.com/8301-250_162-57590626/immigration-reform-foes-count-on-house-to-kill-the-bill/>, CMR)

In light of that amendment, foes of the comprehensive bill admitted, the bill is likely to pass the Senate, but it may yet falter in the House.¶ "It will pass the Senate, but it's dead on arrival in the House," said Sen. Rand Paul, R-Ky., on CNN's "State of the Union."¶ Paul said, while he's "all in favor" of immigration reform, the "border surge" unveiled this week would not guarantee border security because it does not provide Congress an opportunity to verify its implementation.¶ "I think reform should be dependent on border security first," he said. "Without some Congressional authority and without border security first, I can't support the final bill... To me, what really tells me that they're serious would be letting Congress vote on whether the border is secure."¶ "The House is much closer to me," he added.

### 1ar – no pass

#### More ev – House GOP will block reform without improved border security

CBS 6/23 (“Immigration reform foes count on House to kill the bill”, <http://www.cbsnews.com/8301-250_162-57590626/immigration-reform-foes-count-on-house-to-kill-the-bill/>, CMR)

Deriding the "border surge" as a "provision few people have read and ever fewer understand," Lee argued, "We have to look to the fact that the pathway to citizenship begins basically on day one, but it will take many, many years, if not decades, to fully implement all these border security measures."¶ And that may be a problem when the bill reaches House Republicans. "The House of Representatives has said border security first," Lee said. "They are doing exactly the right thing."

#### Won’t pass – border security still too weak to secure House support

Walsh 6/25 (Alex, Immigration reform 'dead on arrival' in House, Sen. Paul says, despite border security amendment success, <http://blog.al.com/wire/2013/06/immigration_reform_dead_on_arr.html>, CMR)

The Senate added stronger border security to its existing immigration reform bill Monday, passing an amendment to that effect with broad support. But at least one senator remains convinced that reform will not make it out of the House.¶ The border security amendment adds $30 billion in spending, The Hill's Alexander Bolton notes. The money would be used to double the number of border patrol agents to 40,000, and add 700 miles of fence along the U.S.-Mexico border.¶ The amendment was approved by a strong vote, with 67 senators voting in favor, against just 27 nays. (Two Democrats weren't present, so the vote may have been even stronger later in the week.)¶ Despite that supportive signal, however, U.S. Sen. Rand Paul, R-Ky., does not see a future for immigration reform in the lower chamber of Congress.¶ “It’s dead on arrival in the House,” Paul recently told Fox News. “The House is much closer to me.”

#### Won’t pass House or Senate – GOP opposition – neg authors exaggerate

Olson 6/11/13 (David, “IMMIGRATION REFORM: Tough road ahead in House”, http://blog.pe.com/2013/06/11/immigration-reform-tough-road-ahead-in-house/)

The Senate voted to advance the bipartisan immigration-reform bill today.¶ But the 82-15 vote margin is misleading. Some senators who voted to move the bill forward likely will vote against it.¶ Sen. John Cornyn of Texas voted “yes” on Tuesday but said, “The bill grants permanent legal status to millions of undocumented immigrants, as currently written, without really any guarantee of securing the border. Now, how would that possibly be a good idea?”¶ Some immigrant-rights groups have argued that the border-security measures are too stringent. They particularly object to tying the achievement of border-security goals to allowing undocumented immigrants to apply for legal residency and, later, citizenship.¶ But one of the bill’s key sponsors, Florida Republican Sen. Marco Rubio, has said the border-security measures will need to be even stricter to gain more Republican support. President Obama Tuesday called for the passage of a bill.¶ “This bill isn’t perfect; it’s a compromise,” Obama said. “Going forward, nobody is going to get everything they want. Not Democrats, not Republicans, not me.”¶ The Democratic-controlled Senate is expected to approve the measure. But getting a bill with a path to citizenship through the Republican-controlled House may be an uphill battle.¶ Last week, the House voted along party lines to end an Obama administration program that provides temporary legalization for many young undocumented immigrants who came to the United States as children.¶ All Inland Republicans voted for the measure, including Rep. Gary Miller, who according to the closely-watched Cook Political Report is the most endangered GOP incumbent in the country in the 2014 elections. Miller’s district is majority Latino and Asian-American and voted by a 16-point margin for President Obama in the 2012 election.¶ Protections for young undocumented immigrants are among the most popular parts of immigration-reform proposals, and a vote for the measure by a vulnerable Republican such as Miller is a sign of how difficult it may be to get Republican House votes for a measure that provides a path to citizenship for millions of undocumented immigrants of all ages. Miller’s office hasn’t responded to my requests for comment.¶ Even though the political muscle that Latinos demonstrated in the November election is probably the biggest reason why members of Congress scrambled to introduce a comprehensive immigration-reform proposal, remember that members of the House care most about their districts – not the political dynamics in national elections.¶ I’ve chatted several times over the past few months with Roy Beck, the executive director of NumbersUSA, which supports more restrictions on immigration. People across the political spectrum have credited the grass-roots group with helping defeat a 2007 immigration overhaul that also had a path to citizenship.¶ Beck argues that the bill will fail in the House in large part because the vast majority of Republican districts are safe GOP bastions with a small percentage of Latino voters.¶ NumbersUSA members – the group says it now has two million – flooded Capitol Hill with phone calls, faxes, emails and letters in 2007 and are being urged to do so again this year.¶ Time will tell how effective the campaign by groups such as NumbersUSA against a path to citizenship will be. But there seems to be little doubt that getting such a bill through the House will be a tough battle that will have consequences in the 2014 elections and beyond.

#### Won’t pass – House-Senate differences prevent final compromise

Ferrechio 5/27/13 (Susan, Chief Congressional Correspondent, “House, Senate nearing showdown over immigration reform”, <http://washingtonexaminer.com/house-senate-nearing-showdown-over-immigration-reform/article/2530506?custom_click=rss>, CMR)

But even as the House and Senate advance their own versions of the bill, differences between them could ultimately sink the chances for a final compromise.¶ House Republicans oppose the path to citizenship and immediate legalization the Senate bill would provide. And Smith called the Senate version "fatally flawed," in part because it lacks adequate border security provisions.¶ Boehner announced last week the House "will not simply take up and accept the bill that is emerging in the Senate if it passes."¶ The Senate is working on a single comprehensive bill that would deal with legalization, border security and other issues. That could be problematic in the House, where House Judiciary Committee Chairman Bob Goodlatte, R-Va., has been parsing the issue into a series of bills more limited in scope. The House approach allows lawmakers to vote separately on various aspects of reform so they can support some and oppose others.¶ Goodlatte last week introduced a bill that would increase visas for high-skilled workers and provide green cards to foreign graduates of U.S. universities who have earned degrees in science, technology and engineering.¶ Goodlatte told The Washington Examiner that he will introduce a bill next week that would bolster enforcement of existing immigration laws.¶ "Step by step," Goodlatte said, describing his approach. "There are lots of problems with the Senate bill."

#### Won’t pass – House GOP opposition to citizenship

Sargent 5/28/13 (Greg, “House GOP could still kill immigration reform”, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/plum-line/wp/2013/05/28/will-house-gop-kill-immigration-reform/>, CMR)

In a sign that immigration reform still faces steep odds in the House, Reuters reports that a significant number of House Republicans are still not convinced that an immigration bill would help GOP outreach to Latino voters. Reuters quotes one representative, Tim Huelskamp of Kansas, capturing the mood of many of his colleagues this way: “There is no evidence to support this idea that Republicans will pick up a lot of votes if we give amnesty to 11 million folks.”¶ Meanwhile, Rep. Mo Brooks of Alabama sees “amnesty” as a slippery slope. “We can’t afford to give amnesty to every person who wants to illegally cross our borders,” he said. “We don’t have enough money in our piggy bank. Amnesty begets more amnesty.”¶ In other words, now that the bipartisan Senate gang of eight’s immigration reform compromise has cleared the Judiciary Committee and made its way to the Senate floor, making it more likely that it will pass the Senate, there’s still the very real possibility that reform will die in the House of Representatives. There, the numbers are not in their favor. House Republicans have long voiced their opposition to a comprehensive bill.¶ That the immigration bill has a long and difficult path to citizenship — thirteen years, with a sizable list of fees and requirements — doesn’t factor into this opposition. The mere fact that some unauthorized immigrants could receive citizenship at some point in the future is enough to inspire opposition. And among House Republicans, this opposition is fairly broad-based; as we saw with the fights over the debt ceiling, the fiscal cliff, and the sequester, Tea Party Republicans have a tight grip on the direction of the chamber.¶ If House Republicans can be convinced of the need for a path to citizenship, then there’s hope for the bill. Otherwise, prospects are dire. Supporters of comprehensive immigration reform won’t settle for anything less than a path to citizenship. And as the above quotes suggest, House Republicans are not persuaded that passing reform will necessarily be good for the GOP.

#### Border security and lack of GOP support

Zornick 6/13/13 (George, “House GOP Revolt Against Immigration Reform Begins”, http://www.thenation.com/blog/174787/house-gop-revolt-against-immigration-reform-begins#axzz2WG9NejUi)

The headline-grabbing debate over immigration reform is happening in the Senate this week, as the entire body debates a series of amendments to the comprehensive legislation passed by the Senate Judiciary Committee last month. There is a very real chance that reform could die there—if, for example, Senator John Cornyn’s border security amendment passes, the bill might become unsupportable for many Democrats.¶ But lurking in the background is an even more difficult fight in the House, where the Republican caucus is much more hostile to reform. House members are beholden to smaller, more conservative districts, and there are no leaders calling for reform analogous to Republicans Marco Rubio and John McCain in the Senate.¶ This week began with some promising signs from the office of House Speaker John Boehner. For months, he said virtually nothing about his strategy for passing immigration reform—not even whether one existed—but Politico reported Monday that “privately, the Ohio Republican is beginning to sketch out a road map to try to pass some version of an overhaul in his chamber.” The next morning, during an ABC News interview, Boehner hinted that he might allow an immigration bill to pass the House with a majority of Democratic votes, thereby abandoning the so-called “Hastert rule.”¶ Without question, that was tremendous news for proponents of immigration reform. But don’t think conservatives opposed to any legislation didn’t notice—and the first unified effort by anti-immigration House members might have now begun.¶ Thursday morning, Glenn Beck’s website The Blaze had the exclusive news that seventy members of the House GOP “are planning a politically risky showdown” with Boehner. Led by Representatives Steve King, Michele Bachmann and Louie Gohmert, the group is demanding two things from Boehner: (1) a special Republican conference meeting about immigration, and (2) a promise to be true to the Hastert Rule.¶ The caucus meeting could be perilous for Boehner—his strategy of keeping the House at a very low temperature and mollifying, at least for now, the hardline anti-immigration members couldn’t survive a head-to-head confrontation. Boehner would have to address their Hastert rule request directly. (Note, too, that conservative activists also began pressuring Boehner on the Hastert rule this week—the heads of the Club for Growth, Heritage Action, the American Conservative Union and the Family Research Council sent Boehner a letter on Tuesday demanding he never stray from the Hastert rule again.)

#### Border security is a poison pill – collapses reform

Frates 6/14 (Chris, “GOP Not Backing Down on Border Security in Immigration Bill”, <http://www.govexec.com/defense/2013/06/gop-not-backing-down-border-security-immigration-bill/64883/>)

Despite publicly rallying around an aggressive plan from Sen. John Cornyn, R-Texas, to secure the border, Republicans are privately conceding that staunch Democratic opposition means it likely doesn’t have the votes to pass.¶ But that doesn’t mean the issue goes down too.¶ Conservatives still want border-security improvements and are warning Democrats that not getting them could jeopardize the immigration-reform bill. At the very least, they argue, it means Democrats won’t come near the 70 votes some Democrats are both predicting and banking on to force the House into action on immigration.¶ GOP Sen. Marco Rubio of Florida, a supporter of Cornyn’s amendment and key architect of the immigration bill, articulated the Republican position best. Asked Wednesday by Sean Hannity if he would oppose the bill if it did not completely secure the border, Rubio hedged, saying, “The thing I’m trying to avoid is all that ultimatum language because I think that undermines what we’re trying to do.”¶ “If the border-security elements of this bill are not in place, we’re wasting our time. This bill’s not going to pass,” he said. “If that doesn’t get in the bill I’m going to keep working to get it in.”¶ Already Rubio is working on his own border-security proposal that could sate some of the conservative appetite for tougher border controls. And other Republican senators are huddling behind closed doors to discuss how to tighten up the border.¶ Even Democrats acknowledge something will likely be added to the bill. “But it won’t be from Cornyn,” a senior Democratic leadership aide said.¶ Democrats went after Cornyn’s proposal—the first border-security amendment to surface during the debate—fast and hard. Democratic Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid called it a “poison pill,” and Sen. Chuck Schumer’s camp essentially called Cornyn a liar for saying that he and the New York Democrat had discussed his amendment.¶ Simply put, Democrats think Cornyn’s amendment is a pretext to oppose the bill, not an attempt to improve it.¶ And they aren’t altogether wrong.¶ If Cornyn’s amendment dies, “that’s all the cover conservatives in border states need to vote against the bill,” said a senior GOP Senate aide.¶ For his part, Cornyn told his colleagues in a closed-door meeting earlier this week that he’d vote for the immigration bill if his changes were approved.¶ Republicans are also playing a bit of longball in the face of Democratic reluctance to move the Senate legislation too far to the right—something Cornyn hinted at Wednesday. “My hope would be that we can improve the bill before it goes over to the House, because as you know, ultimately the endgame here is going to be a House-Senate conference committee that will produce the final outcome.”

#### Border security and citizenship ensure “poison pill” amendments that collapse support

Nakamura 6/12/13 (David, “Obama returns focus to immigration”, http://www.journalgazette.net/article/20130612/NEWS03/306129977/1066)

Critics pushed back quickly as the Senate began debating the legislation. Sen. Ted Cruz, R-Texas, said that while he expected the legislation to pass the Senate, it would fail in the House unless proponents agreed to additional border security measures and backed off a guaranteed path to citizenship for illegal immigrants.¶ “The path to citizenship is the single most divisive issue,” Cruz said.¶ “It’s an issue that the Obama White House and Senate Democrats are insisting on, and by insisting on that, I believe they have designed a bill that is destined to be voted down,” he added.¶ As Obama spoke at the White House, Sen. John Cornyn, R-Texas, laid out his proposal to require 100 percent border security before any undocumented immigrants are eligible for legal status.¶ Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid or Nevada and other Democrats have described Cornyn’s proposal as a “poison pill” amendment that would unravel the bipartisan alliance.

#### Amendment process will derail reform

Dinan 6/11/13 (Stephen, “Poison pills enter bruising Senate battle over immigration reform”, http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2013/jun/11/senate-heads-immigration-filibuster/?page=all#pagebreak)

Senators headed off a filibuster Tuesday and officially brought the immigration reform bill to the chamber floor, marking the first time since 2007 that the full, thorny issue has been back in front of Congress — and with lawmakers anticipating plenty of hurdles ahead.¶ Within the first two hours, lawmakers had filed 44 amendments to the 1,075-page bill. Among those proposed changes are potential poison pills to grant immigration benefits to American citizens’ gay partners, and to make illegal immigrants have to wait until the borders are deemed secure before they can get any legal status.¶ In addition to the hot-button social issues amendments were other nuts-and-bolts proposals that are no less contentious, such as where to set the level for guest-workers who would be allowed into the country to compete for jobs, or whether to make English the official language of the U.S.¶ With the bill now officially before the Senate, the question is which of those amendments will be allowed up for a vote. The pressure there is on Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid, Nevada Democrat, who has said he will allow a little latitude but warned that he would have little patience for those he thinks are trying to undercut the bill rather than working sincerely to improve it.¶ “Be very, very careful of senators who have no intention of voting for this bill, zero, but they have this wonderful amendment they want to offer to improve the bill, understanding, as I do — and I hope you folks also understand this — they have no intention of voting for the bill no matter what happens on amendments,” Mr. Reid told reporters.¶ Mr. Reid’s heavy hand in controlling amendments helped derail a 2007 immigration bill.¶ Mr. Reid is again intent on protecting the crux of the immigration deal, which was worked out by the bipartisan “Gang of Eight” senators, that offers illegal immigrants quick legalization but withholds the full path to citizenship until the government spends more money on border security, creates a new verification system to check workers, and begins to track entries and exits at airports and seaports.¶ That deal, as it stands, cannot pass the chamber, said Sen. Marco Rubio, a Florida Republican who was part of the Gang of Eight and is considered key to selling the bill to conservatives.¶ Mr. Rubio said the legislation needs stiffer border security, better checks of visitors entering and leaving the country, and more stringent English-language requirements.¶ Under the bill, illegal immigrants who eventually apply for permanent residency must demonstrate that they understand English, or must show that they have enrolled in classes to learn the language.¶ Mr. Rubio said allowing immigrants to check a box by enrolling in classes is a loophole. He said he would offer an amendment striking that option, which would mean anyone seeking full legal residency would have to prove that they understand English.¶ “This is one of the bill’s shortcomings that came to light, which we can now fix,” Mr. Rubio said.¶ That is not the only language fight brewing.¶ Sen. James M. Inhofe, Oklahoma Republican, introduced an amendment that would let businesses declare English-only policies in their workplaces, and another that would make English the official language of the U.S.¶ Designating the official language polls exceptionally well with voters, but proved to be contentious when Congress debated immigration reform in 2006 and 2007.¶ The 82-15 vote Tuesday to head off a filibuster marked an auspicious start for this year’s debate. In a similar vote in 2007, supporters got just 69 votes.¶ The difference this year was that far more Republicans are eager to at least hold the debate, with many of them feeling that their political futures depend on finding a way to reach out to Hispanic voters who view the immigration issue as a litmus test.¶ “This overwhelming vote — a majority of both parties — starts this bill off on just the right foot,” said Sen. Charles E. Schumer, New York Democrat.¶ Now the focus will be on about 20 Republicans who voted to begin the debate but who are likely to want to see major changes before they support the final product.¶ One of those is Minority Leader Mitch McConnell of Kentucky, who said Tuesday that the legislation has “serious flaws.”¶ He seemed to accept the legalization of illegal immigrants, saying his concerns lie chiefly with how the bill handles border security and with the taxpayer benefits that newly legalized illegal immigrants may be eligible — such as tax credits.¶ “I’m going to need more than an assurance from [Homeland Security Secretary Janet] Napolitano, for instance, that the border is secure to feel comfortable about the situation on the border,” Mr. McConnell said.¶ He said he would support an amendment by Sen. John Cornyn, Texas Republican, to require the border to be secured before illegal immigrants can gain initial legal status.¶ Mr. Reid has declared that a poison pill.¶ Then there’s the gay-rights amendment from Sen. Patrick J. Leahy, Vermont Democrat. While federal law doesn’t recognize same-sex marriage, his amendment would grant immigration benefits to partners in states that perform such unions.¶ “Seeking equal protection under our laws for the LGBT community is the right thing to do,” Mr. Leahy said in a statement.¶ Mr. Leahy made a similar move in the Senate Judiciary Committee last month, but withdrew the amendment at the last moment. Although he was committed to the issue, he said, he didn’t want to threaten to bring down the entire bill over gay-rights questions.¶ Offering it on the floor is less dangerous because it likely will take 60 votes to add it to the bill — a threshold he is unlikely to achieve. Seeking a vote now would give him a chance to take a stand without fear of derailing the full bill.¶ Some of the Catholic and Evangelical leaders that are supporting the immigration bill had warned they could withdraw their support over the gay-rights issue.

### 1ar – no pass – citizenship

#### More ev – GOP opposition to citizenship ensures the deal falls apart

Reuters 5/25/13 (“Immigration Reform Faces Challenge In House Of Representatives”, <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/05/26/immigraton-reform_n_3339211.html>, CMR)

WASHINGTON, May 25 (Reuters) - The biggest proposed overhaul of U.S. immigration laws in a generation won bipartisan approval from a powerful Senate committee last week, but there is a strong chance that Republicans in the House of Representatives will end up killing it.¶ The problem: House Republicans are far from convinced by arguments from party leaders that passage of the bill would help Republicans draw support from Hispanic voters. Many also believe any kind of amnesty for the estimated 11 million immigrants who are in the United States illegally is just plain wrong.¶ "There is no evidence to support this idea that Republicans will pick up a lot of votes if we give amnesty to 11 million folks," said Representative Tim Huelskamp, a Kansas Republican.¶ One possibility is that the House will vote for watered-down reform, including more visas for highly skilled workers. But it likely will not include a way for the undocumented to stay legally and eventually get on a special pathway to U.S. citizenship.¶ Senate Democrats and even some Senate Republicans say there is no way a comprehensive immigration bill could win final congressional approval without a pathway to citizenship.¶ "It's a non-starter," said Democratic Senator Charles Schumer of New York, a member of the Gang of Eight senators who wrote the bipartisan Senate bill.¶ Some House Republican lawmakers say that even if the party would gain votes by supporting sweeping reform, that's no reason to back otherwise objectionable legislation.¶ "I don't think we should be worried about the political impact but instead what is in the best interest of America," said Republican Representative Mo Brooks of Alabama.¶ Besides, he said, "People who are going to break our laws, I don't want them in this country."¶ This kind of opposition from House Republicans may pose the biggest threat to White House-backed legislation set to come next month before the full Senate, which Obama's Democrats hold, 55-45.

### 2ac – no spillover

#### No spillover

Berger 3-4, Judson 2013, “Recurring budget crises could put squeeze on Obama's second-term priorities,” Fox News, <http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2013/03/04/recurring-budget-crises-could-put-squeeze-on-obama-second-term-priorities/#ixzz2OknXmt3G>, CMR

Rep. Luis Gutierrez, D-Ill., a vocal advocate for immigration reform, voiced confidence Monday that the administration and Congress could handle the busy agenda. ¶ "The spirit of bipartisan cooperation that is keeping the immigration issue moving forward has not been poisoned by the sequester and budget stalemate, so far," he said in a statement. "The two sets of issues seem to exist in parallel universes where I can disagree with my Republican colleagues strenuously on budget matters, but still work with them effectively to eventually reach an immigration compromise. ... I remain extremely optimistic that immigration reform is going to happen this year." ¶ Immigration reform efforts are still marching along despite the budget drama. Obama met last week on the issue with Sens. John McCain, R-Ariz., and Lindsey Graham, R-S.C., who both are part of a bipartisan group crafting legislation.

### 1ar – no spillover

#### Issues compartmentalized

Edwards 2k [Distinguished Professor of Political Science, director of the Center for Presidential Studies, Texas A&M University (George C. III, March. “Building Coalitions.” Presidential Studies Quarterly, Vol. 30, Iss. 1.)]

Besides not considering the full range of available views, members of Congress are not generally in a position to make trade-offs between policies. Because of its decentralization, Congress usually considers policies serially, that is, without reference to other policies. Without an integrating mechanism, members have few means by which to set and enforce priorities and to emphasize the policies with which the president is most concerned. This latter point is especially true when the opposition party controls Congress.

### 2ac – xo solves

#### Executive actions solves

Kumar 3/19 (Anita, “Obama turning to executive power to get what he wants”, 2013, <http://www.mcclatchydc.com/2013/03/19/186309/obama-turning-to-executive-power.html#storylink=cpy>, CMR)

WASHINGTON — President Barack Obama came into office four years ago skeptical of pushing the power of the White House to the limit, especially if it appeared to be circumventing Congress.¶ Now, as he launches his second term, Obama has grown more comfortable wielding power to try to move his own agenda forward, particularly when a deeply fractured, often-hostile Congress gets in his way.¶ He’s done it with a package of tools, some of which date to George Washington and some invented in the modern era of an increasingly powerful presidency. And he’s done it with a frequency that belies his original campaign criticisms of predecessor George W. Bush, invites criticisms that he’s bypassing the checks and balances of Congress and the courts, and whets the appetite of liberal activists who want him to do even more to advance their goals.¶ While his decision to send drones to kill U.S. citizens suspected of terrorism has garnered a torrent of criticism, his use of executive orders and other powers at home is deeper and wider.¶ He delayed the deportation of young illegal immigrants when Congress wouldn’t agree. He ordered the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention to research gun violence, which Congress halted nearly 15 years ago. He told the Justice Department to stop defending the Defense of Marriage Act, deciding that the 1996 law defining marriage as between a man and a woman was unconstitutional. He’s vowed to act on his own if Congress didn’t pass policies to prepare for climate change.¶ Arguably more than any other president in modern history, he’s using executive actions, primarily orders, to bypass or pressure a Congress where the opposition Republicans can block any proposal.¶ “It’s gridlocked and dysfunctional. The place is a mess,” said Rena Steinzor, a law professor at the University of Maryland. “I think (executive action) is an inevitable tool given what’s happened.”¶ Now that Obama has showed a willingness to use those tactics, advocacy groups, supporters and even members of Congress are lobbying him to do so more and more.¶ The Center for Progressive Reform, a liberal advocacy group composed of law professors, including Steinzor, has pressed Obama to sign seven executive orders on health, safety and the environment during his second term.¶ Seventy environmental groups wrote a letter urging the president to restrict emissions at existing power plants.¶ Sen. Barbara Mikulski, D-Md., the chairwoman of the Appropriations Committee, sent a letter to the White House asking Obama to ban federal contractors from retaliating against employees who share salary information.¶ Gay rights organizations recently demonstrated in front of the White House to encourage the president to sign an executive order to bar discrimination based on sexual orientation or gender identity by companies that have federal contracts, eager for Obama to act after nearly two decades of failed attempts to get Congress to pass a similar bill.¶ “It’s ridiculous that we’re having to push this hard for the president to simply pick up a pen,” said Heather Cronk, the managing director of the gay rights group GetEQUAL. “It’s reprehensible that, after signing orders on gun control, cybersecurity and all manner of other topics, the president is still laboring over this decision.”¶ The White House didn’t respond to repeated requests for comment.¶ In January, Obama said he continued to believe that legislation was “sturdier and more stable” than executive actions, but that sometimes they were necessary, such as his January directive for the federal government to research gun violence.¶ “There are certain issues where a judicious use of executive power can move the argument forward or solve problems that are of immediate-enough import that we can’t afford not to do it,” the former constitutional professor told The New Republic magazine.

### 1ar – xo solves

#### Obama can solve immigration unilaterally

Lillis 2/16 Mike, “Dems: Obama can act unilaterally on immigration reform”, thehill.com/blogs/regwatch/administration/283583-dems-recognize-that-obama-can-act-unilaterally-on-immigration-reform, (accessed by CMR on February 16th, 2013)

President Obama can – and will – take steps on immigration reform in the event Congress doesn't reach a comprehensive deal this year, according to several House Democratic leaders.¶ While the Democrats are hoping Congress will preclude any executive action by enacting reforms legislatively, they say the administration has the tools to move unilaterally if the bipartisan talks on Capitol Hill break down. Furthermore, they say, Obama stands poised to use them.¶ "I don't think the president will be hands off on immigration for any moment in time," Rep. Xavier Becerra (D-Calif.), the head of the House Democratic Caucus, told reporters this week. "He's ready to move forward if we're not."¶ Rep. Joseph Crowley (N.Y.), vice chairman of the Democratic Caucus, echoed that message, saying Obama is "not just beating the drum," for immigration reform, "he's actually the drum major."¶ "There are limitations as to what he can do with executive order," Crowley said Wednesday, "but he did say that if Congress continued to fail to act that he would take steps and measures to enact common-sense executive orders to move this country forward."¶ Rep. Raul Grijalva (D-Ariz.), who heads the Congressional Progressive Caucus, said there are "plenty" of executive steps Obama could take if Congress fails to pass a reform package. "The huge one," Grijalva said, is "the waiving of deportation" in order to keep families together.¶ "Four million of the undocumented [immigrants] are people who overstayed their visas to stay with family," he said Friday. "So that would be, I think, an area in which … there's a great deal of executive authority that he could deal with."¶ The administration could also waive visa caps, Grijalva said, to ensure that industries like agriculture have ample access to low-skilled labor.¶ "Everybody's for getting the smart and the talented in, but there's also a labor flow issue," he said.¶ To be sure, Obama and congressional Democrats would prefer the reforms to come through Congress – both because that route would solidify the changes into law and because it would require bipartisan buy-in.¶ Still, House Republicans have been loath to accept one of the central elements of Obama's strategy: A pathway to citizenship for the estimated 11-12 million undocumented people currently living in the country – a move which many conservatives deem "amnesty."¶ Indeed, when the House Judiciary Committee met earlier this month on immigration reform, much of the discussion focused on whether there is some middle ground between citizenship and mass deportation.¶ “If we can find a solution that is … short of a pathway to citizenship, but better than just kicking 12 million people out, why is that not a good solution?” Rep. Raul Labrador (R-Idaho) asked during the hearing.¶ Obama on Tuesday spent a good portion of his State of the Union address urging Congress to send him a comprehensive immigration reform bill this year. Central to that package, he said, should be provisions for "strong border security," for "establishing a responsible pathway to earned citizenship" and for "fixing the legal immigration system to cut waiting periods and attract the highly-skilled entrepreneurs and engineers that will help create jobs and grow our economy."¶ "We know what needs to be done," Obama said. "So let’s get this done."¶ Becerra said he and other immigration reformers have had two meetings with the White House on immigration this month, one with the executive team working on the issue and, more recently, with Obama himself. Becerra said administration officials "essentially" know what reforms they want – "and they have communicated that to both House and Senate members, bipartisanly" – but they also want Congress to take the lead.¶ "They're giving Congress a chance to work its will to move this," Becerra said. "But … I don't think he's going to wait too long.¶ "If you were to ask him would he be prepared to submit a bill if Congress isn't ready … he would tell you, I have no doubt, 'I can do it in a heartbeat,'" Becerra added. "The president will move forward where he can if Congress doesn't act."¶ Indeed, Obama has already shown a willingness to do just that. Last summer, just months before November's elections, Obama shocked political observers when he launched a program through the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) allowing undocumented immigrants brought to the country as children to remain without threat of deportation. The two-year "deferred action" was modeled on the Dream Act legislation that has been unable to pass Congress.¶ The change was not an executive order, but an extension of "prosecutorial discretion" on the part of the DHS.¶ Although conservatives howled about administrative overreach, Obama's gamble paid off, as the president won more than 70 percent of the Hispanic vote at the polls – a margin that has fueled the drive for immigration reform this year, as GOP leaders are anxious to avoid a similar divide in 2016.¶ Grijalva said the expansion of the deferred action program represents another opportunity for Obama to move immigration reform administratively.

**President has wide authority – solves the impact\*\*\***

**Kerwin** et al., March 20**11** [Donald M Kerwin, VP for Programs at the Migration Policy Institute, “Executive Action on Immigration”, <http://www.migrationpolicy.org/pubs/administrativefixes.pdf>, CMR]

It is now commonplace to describe the nation’s immigration system as broken. The presence of 11 million unauthorized residents – almost 30 percent of the nation’s foreign-born population – vividly illustrates the problem. **Congress has failed** in successive efforts **over several years to enact reforms.** **Whether reform initiatives move ahead or stall in this new Congress**, **a wide body of immigration law is on the books**, **executive-branch agencies administer and enforce those laws daily, and** approximately **1 million people immigrate legally** to the United States **each year.** In short, current laws and actions taken by immigration officials affect millions of lives anually. **In the absence of legislation**, **the locus for policy action increasingly resides in the executive branch**, **intensifying the imperative for policies,** programs, and procedures **that are effective and fair in advancing the core goals of the nation’s immigration system: promoting family unity, meeting legitimate labor market needs, offering protection** from persecution, **and awarding US citizenship** as an important step toward full incorporation into US society. Achieving these goals depends on effective immigration enforcement that ensures both border and national security, economic competitiveness, community safety, and a level playing field for American workers.

### 2ac – impact d

#### **New immigrants not key---immigration and visas already increasing**

Porter 2-5 – Eduardo Porter, writer for the New York Times, February 5th, 2013, "Immigration Reform Issue: The Effect on the Budget" [www.nytimes.com/2013/02/06/business/immigration-reform-issue-the-effect-on-the-budget.html?pagewanted=all&pagewanted=print](http://www.nytimes.com/2013/02/06/business/immigration-reform-issue-the-effect-on-the-budget.html?pagewanted=all&pagewanted=print)

Yet immigration reform today means something quite different than it did in 2007. Notably, the elements needed to stop the flow of illegal immigrants north are much less important to the enterprise. The Obama administration has already spent huge amounts of money on border enforcement. Today, border policing costs about $18 billion a year — nearly 50 percent more than it did in 2006. And deportations have soared. What’s more, illegal immigration has slowed to a trickle, as Mexico has grown more robustly than the United States. The illegal immigrant population has even been shrinking in the last few years. And it may continue to do so as the Mexican population of prime migration-age people stops growing.¶ Also, many employers have already gotten some of what they wanted: the number of workers entering the United States on temporary visas for low-end jobs in agriculture and other industries has increased sharply.¶ “The discussion is in a different environment,” said Gordon H. Hanson, an expert on the economics of immigration at the University of California, San Diego. “The flow of new immigrants is not the story anymore.”

**(--) No shortage of skilled workers—we can solve the impact now:**

Robert X. **Cringely**, 10/23/20**12** (staff writer, “What Americans don’t know about H-1B visas could hurt us all,” <http://www.cringely.com/2012/10/23/what-americans-dont-know-about-h-1b-visas-could-hurt-us-all/>, Accessed 1/23/2013, )

**A key argument for H-1B has always been that there’s a shortage of technical talent in U.S. IT**. This has been taken as a given by both major political parties. But it’s wrong. Here are **six rigorous studies** (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6) that **show there is no shortage of STEM workers in the U.S. nor the likelihood of such a shortage in years to come**.¶ You may recall a recent column here where the IT community in Memphis, TN proved there was no labor shortage in that technology hotbed.¶ **The whole labor shortage argument is total hogwash.** Yes, there is a labor shortage at substandard wages.

**(--) No skilled worker shortage—skill deficiencies of current workforce are overstated:**

Ed **Crego,** 7/19/20**12** (“The Skilled Worker Shortage Fallacy,” <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/george-munoz-frank-islam-and-ed-crego/the-skilled-worker-shorta_b_1677881.html>, Accessed 1/23/2013, )

**America has a serious shortage of skilled workers and that is a primary cause of our lack of job creation. Right? Wrong!**¶ We have been bemused for the past few years as an ecumenical group of business leaders, academics and experts have put forward the argument that training and developing a more skilled workforce would help drive job creation. It seems to us that this is a basic misunderstanding of cause and effect.¶ We can have a philosophical debate about which came first -- the chicken or the egg. But when it comes to job creation there should be no such argument. Organizations and individuals who create new organizations are the chicken -- they are the job creators. Employees and skilled workers are the eggs -- they are the job holders.¶ That's not to say that we don't need skilled workers in the United States. But, **as a wide variety of recent studies have demonstrated, the extent to which the skills of the workforce influences business decisions is a modest one and the actual "skill deficiencies" of the current American workforce may be significantly overstated.**

### 2ac – impact d – economy

#### Won’t solve the economy

Scruggs 2/23 (Mike, “Immigration Myths: propping up foolish immigration policies”, <http://www.thetribunepapers.com/2013/02/23/immigration-myths-propping-up-foolish-immigration-policies/>, CMR)

Employment is the great magnet for illegal immigration. **Many CIS studies and the work of Harvard labor economist** George **Borjas confirm that**, although there are many notable exceptions, taken as a whole the last several decades of **immigrants are not really adding to the economy**. **They** add to the profits of those who employ cheap imported labor, but they **are displacing American workers**, **and their numbers are creating an excess labor supply driving American wages down.** **This is particularly acute for Americans with a high school education or less** and becoming a problem at higher skill levels. That is the reason American workers are not benefiting from top-line economic growth. As Robert Rector of the Heritage Foundation has pointed out, **the excessive number of unskilled and poorly educated immigrants**—about 80 percent of the total—**has created a considerable fiscal drag** on federal, state, and local governments, and taxpayers. The Federation of Americans for Immigration Reform (FAIR) estimates this to be about $100 billion per year considering ONLY education, healthcare, and law enforcement. There are other significant but less easily quantified burdens impacting society as well.

### 2ac – mexico aff – link turn

#### Turn: Securing effective border security cooperation with Mexico key to immigration reform

AP 5/2/13 (“Obama to pitch immigration overhaul in Mexico”, <http://articles.washingtonpost.com/2013-05-02/business/38977838_1_security-strategy-border-security-security-relationship>, CMR)

WASHINGTON — President Barack Obama has his domestic ambition at the top of his travel agenda as he travels to Mexico on Thursday. To sell his immigration overhaul back home, he needs a growing economy in Mexico and a Mexican president willing to help him secure the border.¶ Obama was to fly to Mexico City on Thursday to meet with President Enrique Pena Nieto, eager to promote Mexico's economic success and the neighboring country's place as the second largest export market for U.S. goods and services. Mexicans will be hanging on the president's words, but Obama also has in mind an important audience back in the United States.¶ Though the role played by Latino voters in last year's U.S. presidential election gets much credit for the current momentum for changing immigration laws and providing a path to citizenship for 11 million immigrants in the U.S. illegally, another reason for the change in attitudes is that stronger border protections and the recession have been disincentives to cross into the U.S. As a result, illegal immigration has declined.¶ "With Mexico, first and foremost, they are critical to our ability to secure the border," said Ben Rhodes, an Obama deputy national security adviser. "All the immigration plans that have been contemplated put a focus on securing the border as an essential priority and starting point for immigration reform."

### 2ac – mexico aff – link defense

#### Plan avoids partisanship

CSIS 4 (U.S.-Mexico Border¶ Security and the¶ Evolving Security¶ Relationship¶ Recommendations for¶ Policymakers, April, <http://csis.org/files/media/csis/pubs/0404_bordersecurity.pdf>, CMR)

There can be no doubt that the future of Mexico-U.S. relations will for the ¶ indefinite future be shaped to a large degree by how the two countries work ¶ together to manage, selectively inspect, and regulate cross-border traffic. One ¶ objective, which will perhaps be of equal importance in both countries, is that no ¶ attack on the United States be perpetrated from terrorist bases in Mexico or that no ¶ terrorists easily cross the border on their way to attacking U.S. targets. In the ¶ United States, it is highly unlikely that there will be any significant partisan political ¶ disagreements about these and related imperatives of border security.

**2ac – link turn – winners win**

**PC isn’t finite or key – the plan is a win that spills over to future victories**

**Hirsh 2/7** – chief correspondent of National Journal (Michael, “There’s No Such Thing as Political Capital”, <http://www.nationaljournal.com/magazine/there-s-no-such-thing-as-political-capital-20130207>, CMR)

On Tuesday, in his State of the Union address, President **Obama will** do what every president does this time of year. For about 60 minutes, he will **lay out a sprawling and ambitious wish list** highlighted by gun control and immigration reform, climate change and debt reduction. In response, the **pundits will** do what they always do this time of year: They will **talk about how** unrealistic most of the proposals are, discussions often informed by sagacious reckonings of how **much “political capital” Obama possesses to push his program through**.¶ Most of **this talk will have no bearing on what actually happens** over the next four years.¶ Consider this: Three months ago, just before the November election, if someone had talked seriously about Obama having enough political capital to oversee passage of both immigration reform and gun-control legislation at the beginning of his second term—even after winning the election by 4 percentage points and 5 million votes (the actual final tally)—this person would have been called crazy and stripped of his pundit’s license. (It doesn’t exist, but it ought to.) In his first term, in a starkly polarized country, the president had been so frustrated by GOP resistance that he finally issued a limited executive order last August permitting immigrants who entered the country illegally as children to work without fear of deportation for at least two years. Obama didn’t dare to even bring up gun control, a Democratic “third rail” that has cost the party elections and that actually might have been even less popular on the right than the president’s health care law. And yet, for reasons that have very little to do with Obama’s personal prestige or popularity—variously put in terms of a “mandate” or “political capital”—chances are fair that both will now happen.¶ What changed? In the case of gun control, of course, it wasn’t the election. It was the horror of the 20 first-graders who were slaughtered in Newtown, Conn., in mid-December. The sickening reality of little girls and boys riddled with bullets from a high-capacity assault weapon seemed to precipitate a sudden tipping point in the national conscience. One thing changed after another. Wayne LaPierre of the National Rifle Association marginalized himself with poorly chosen comments soon after the massacre. The pro-gun lobby, once a phalanx of opposition, began to fissure into reasonables and crazies. Former Rep. Gabrielle Giffords, D-Ariz., who was shot in the head two years ago and is still struggling to speak and walk, started a PAC with her husband to appeal to the moderate middle of gun owners. Then she gave riveting and poignant testimony to the Senate, challenging lawmakers: “Be bold.”¶ As a result, momentum has appeared to build around some kind of a plan to curtail sales of the most dangerous weapons and ammunition and the way people are permitted to buy them. It’s impossible to say now whether such a bill will pass and, if it does, whether it will make anything more than cosmetic changes to gun laws. But one thing is clear: The political tectonics have shifted dramatically in very little time. Whole new possibilities exist now that didn’t a few weeks ago.¶ Meanwhile, the Republican members of the Senate’s so-called Gang of Eight are pushing hard for a new spirit of compromise on immigration reform, a sharp change after an election year in which the GOP standard-bearer declared he would make life so miserable for the 11 million illegal immigrants in the U.S. that they would “self-deport.” But this turnaround has very little to do with Obama’s personal influence—his political mandate, as it were. It has almost entirely to do with just two numbers: 71 and 27. That’s 71 percent for Obama, 27 percent for Mitt Romney, the breakdown of the Hispanic vote in the 2012 presidential election. Obama drove home his advantage by giving a speech on immigration reform on Jan. 29 at a Hispanic-dominated high school in Nevada, a swing state he won by a surprising 8 percentage points in November. But the movement on immigration has mainly come out of the Republican Party’s recent introspection, and the realization by its more thoughtful members, such as Sen. Marco Rubio of Florida and Gov. Bobby Jindal of Louisiana, that without such a shift the party may be facing demographic death in a country where the 2010 census showed, for the first time, that white births have fallen into the minority. It’s got nothing to do with Obama’s political capital or, indeed, Obama at all.¶ The point is not that “political capital” is a meaningless term. Often it is a synonym for “mandate” or “momentum” in the aftermath of a decisive election—and just about every politician ever elected has tried to claim more of a mandate than he actually has. Certainly, Obama can say that because he was elected and Romney wasn’t, he has a better claim on the country’s mood and direction. Many pundits still defend political capital as a useful metaphor at least. “It’s an unquantifiable but meaningful concept,” says Norman Ornstein of the American Enterprise Institute. “You can’t really look at a president and say he’s got 37 ounces of political capital. But the fact is, it’s a concept that matters, if you have popularity and some momentum on your side.”¶ The real problem is that **the idea of political capital**—or mandates, or momentum—**is so poorly defined that presidents and pundits often get it wrong.** “Presidents usually over-estimate it,” says George Edwards, a presidential scholar at Texas A&M University. “The best kind of **political capital**—some sense of an electoral mandate to do something—**is very rare. It almost never happens**. In 1964, maybe. And to some degree in 1980.” For that reason, **political capital is a concept that misleads far more than it enlightens. It is distortionary**. It conveys the idea that we know more than we really do about the ever-elusive concept of political power, and it discounts the way unforeseen events can suddenly change everything. Instead, **it suggests, erroneously, that a political figure has a concrete amount of political capital to invest, just as someone might have real investment capital—that a particular leader can bank his gains, and the size of his account determines what he can do at any given moment in history**.¶ Naturally, any president has practical and electoral limits. Does he have a majority in both chambers of Congress and a cohesive coalition behind him? Obama has neither at present. And unless a surge in the economy—at the moment, still stuck—or some other great victory gives him more momentum, it is inevitable that the closer Obama gets to the 2014 election, the less he will be able to get done. Going into the midterms, Republicans will increasingly avoid any concessions that make him (and the Democrats) stronger.¶ But the abrupt emergence of the immigration and gun-control issues illustrates how suddenly shifts in mood can occur and how political interests can align in new ways just as suddenly. Indeed, **the pseudo-concept of political capital masks a larger truth about Washington that is kindergarten simple: You just don’t know what you can do until you try.** Or **as Ornstein** himself **once wrote** years ago, “**Winning wins**.” In theory, and in practice, **depending on Obama’s handling of any particular issue, even in a polarized time**, **he could still deliver on a lot of his second-term goals,** depending on his skill and the breaks. Unforeseen catalysts can appear, like Newtown. Epiphanies can dawn, such as when many Republican Party leaders suddenly woke up in panic to the huge disparity in the Hispanic vote.¶ Some **political scientists who study the elusive calculus of how to pass legislation and run successful presidencies say that political capital is**, at best, **an empty concept**, **and** that almost **nothing in the academic literature successfully quantifies or even defines it.** “It can refer to a very abstract thing, like a president’s popularity, but there’s no mechanism there. That makes it kind of useless,” says Richard Bensel, a government professor at Cornell University. Even Ornstein concedes that the calculus is far more complex than the term suggests. **Winning on one issue often changes the calculation for the next issue; there is never any known amount of capital**. “The idea here is**, if an issue comes up where the conventional wisdom is that president is not going to get what he wants, and he gets it, then each time that happens, it changes the calculus of the other actors”** Ornstein says. “**If they think he’s going to win, they may change positions to get on the winning side. It’s a bandwagon effect.”**¶ALL THE WAY WITH LBJ¶ Sometimes, **a clever practitioner of power can get more done just because he’s aggressive and knows the hallways of Congress well**. Texas A&M’s Edwards is right to say that the outcome of the 1964 election, Lyndon Johnson’s landslide victory over Barry Goldwater, was one of the few that conveyed a mandate. But one of the main reasons for that mandate (in addition to Goldwater’s ineptitude as a candidate) was President Johnson’s masterful use of power leading up to that election, and his ability to get far more done than anyone thought possible, given his limited political capital. In the newest volume in his exhaustive study of LBJ, The Passage of Power, historian Robert Caro recalls Johnson getting cautionary advice after he assumed the presidency from the assassinated John F. Kennedy in late 1963. Don’t focus on a long-stalled civil-rights bill, advisers told him, because it might jeopardize Southern lawmakers’ support for a tax cut and appropriations bills the president needed. “One of the wise, practical people around the table [said that] the presidency has only a certain amount of coinage to expend, and you oughtn’t to expend it on this,” Caro writes. (Coinage, of course, was what political capital was called in those days.) Johnson replied, “Well, what the hell’s the presidency for?”¶

**2ac – link turn – winners win (GOP unity)**

**Forcing controversial fights key to Obama’s agenda—the alt is gridlock**

**Dickerson ’13** John Dickerson, Slate, 1/18/13, Go for the Throat!, [www.slate.com/articles/news\_and\_politics/politics/2013/01/barack\_obama\_s\_second\_inaugural\_address\_the\_president\_should\_declare\_war.single.html](http://www.slate.com/articles/news_and_politics/politics/2013/01/barack_obama_s_second_inaugural_address_the_president_should_declare_war.single.html), CMR

On Monday, President Obama will preside over the grand reopening of his administration. It would be altogether fitting if he stepped to the microphone, looked down the mall, and let out a sigh: so many people expecting so much from a government that appears capable of so little. A second inaugural suggests new beginnings, but this one is being bookended by dead-end debates. **Gridlock** over the fiscal cliff **preceded** it and **gridlock** over the debt limit, sequester, and budget will follow. After the election, **the same people are in power in all the branches of government and they don't get along. There's no indication that** the president's **clashes with** House Republicans **will end soon**. Inaugural speeches are supposed to be huge and stirring. Presidents haul our heroes onstage, from George Washington to Martin Luther King Jr. George W. Bush brought the Liberty Bell. They use history to make greatness and achievements seem like something you can just take down from the shelf. Americans are not stuck in the rut of the day. But this might be too much for Obama’s second inaugural address: After the last four years, how do you call the nation and its elected representatives to common action while standing on the steps of a building where collective action goes to die? That bipartisan bag of tricks has been tried and it didn’t work. People don’t believe it. Congress' approval rating is 14 percent, the lowest in history. In a December Gallup poll, 77 percent of those asked said the way Washington works is doing “serious harm” to the country. **The challenge for** President **Obama’s** speech is the challenge of his **second term: how to be great when the environment stinks. Enhancing the president’s legacy requires** something **more than** simply the clever application of **predictable stratagems**. Washington’s **partisan rancor**, the size of the problems facing government, **and the limited amount of time before Obama is a lame duck all point to a single conclusion: The president** who came into office speaking in lofty terms about bipartisanship and cooperation **can only cement his legacy if he destroys the GOP**. If he wants to transform American politics, **he must go for the throat**. President Obama could, of course, resign himself to tending to the achievements of his first term. He'd make sure health care reform is implemented, nurse the economy back to health, and put the military on a new footing after two wars. But he's more ambitious than that. He ran for president as a one-term senator with no executive experience. In his first term, he pushed for the biggest overhaul of health care possible because, as he told his aides, he wanted to make history. He may already have made it. There's no question that he is already a president of consequence. But there's no sign he's content to ride out the second half of the game in the Barcalounger. He is approaching gun control, climate change, and immigration with wide and excited eyes. He's not going for caretaker. How should the president proceed then, if he wants to be bold? The Barack **Obama** of the first administration **might have approached the task by finding** some **Republicans to deal with and** then start agreeing to some of their demands in hope that he would **win some of their votes**. It's the traditional approach. Perhaps he could add a good deal more schmoozing with lawmakers, too. **That's the old way. He has abandoned that.** **He doesn't think it will work** and **he doesn't have the time.** As Obama explained in his last press conference, he thinks the **Republicans are dead set on opposing him**. **They cannot be unchained by schmoozing**. **Even if Obama were wrong about Republican intransigence, other constraints will limit the chance for cooperation**. **Republican lawmakers worried about primary challenges** in 2014 **are not going to be willing partners.** He probably has at most 18 months before people start dropping the lame-duck label in close proximity to his name. **Obama’s only remaining option is to pulverize**. Whether he succeeds in passing legislation or not, given his ambitions, his goal should be to delegitimize his opponents. **Through a series of clarifying fights over controversial issues, he can force Republicans to** either side with their coalition's most extreme elements or **cause a rift in the party that will leave it**, at least temporarily, **in disarray**.

### 1ar – winners win - general

**Winners win – legislative victories build momentum**

**Hirsh 2/7** – chief correspondent of National Journal (Michael, “There’s No Such Thing as Political Capital”, <http://www.nationaljournal.com/magazine/there-s-no-such-thing-as-political-capital-20130207>, CMR)

**In terms of Obama’s second-term agenda, what all these shifting tides of momentum and political calculation mean is this: Anything goes**. Obama has no more elections to win, and he needs to worry only about the support he will have in the House and Senate after 2014. But if he picks issues that the country’s mood will support—such as, perhaps, immigration reform and gun control—**there is no reason to think he can’t win far more victories** **than any of the careful calculators of political capital now believe is possible**, including battles over tax reform and deficit reduction.¶ Amid today’s atmosphere of Republican self-doubt, a new, more mature Obama seems to be emerging, one who has his agenda clearly in mind and will ride the mood of the country more adroitly. **If he can get some early wins**—as he already has, apparently, on the fiscal cliff and the upper-income tax increase—**that will create momentum, and one win may well lead to others. “Winning wins.”**

**Winners Wins**

**Marshall & Prins, Poli Sci Profs, 11** (September 2011, Bryan W. Marshall --- associate professor of political science at Miami University, Brandon C. Prins --- associate professor of political science at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Presidential Studies Quarterly, “Power or Posturing? Policy Availability and Congressional Influence on U.S. Presidential Decisions to Use Force”, online, CMR)

**Presidents rely heavily on Congress in converting their political capital into real policy success. Policy success not only shapes the reelection prospects of presidents, but it also builds the president’s reputation for political effectiveness and fuels the prospect for subsequent gains in political capital** (Light 1982). Moreover, the president’s legislative success in foreign policy is correlated with success on the domestic front. On this point, some have largely disavowed the two-presidencies distinction while others have even argued that foreign policy has become a mere extension of domestic policy (Fleisher et al. 2000; Oldfield and Wildavsky 1989) **Presidents implicitly understand that there exists a linkage between their actions in one policy area and their ability to affect another**. The use of force is no exception; in promoting and protecting U.S. interests abroad, presidential decisions are made with an eye toward managing political capital at home (Fordham 2002).

**2ac – pc not key**

**Political capital is irrelevant**

**Dickinson 9** (Matthew, previously taught at Harvard University, where he also received his Ph.D, professor of political science at Middlebury College, “Sotomayor, Obama and Presidential Power,” May 26, 2009 Presidential Power <http://blogs.middlebury.edu/presidentialpower/2009/05/26/sotamayor-obama-and-presidential-power/>, CMR]

As for Sotomayor, from here the path toward almost certain confirmation goes as follows: the Senate Judiciary Committee is slated to hold hearings sometime this summer (this involves both written depositions and of course open hearings), which should lead to formal Senate approval before Congress adjourns for its summer recess in early August. So Sotomayor will likely take her seat in time for the start of the new Court session on October 5. (I talk briefly about the likely politics of the nomination process below). What is of more interest to me, however, is what her selection reveals about the basis of presidential power. **Political scientists, like baseball writers evaluating hitters, have devised numerous means of measuring a president’s influence in Congress.** I will devote a separate post to discussing these, but in brief, **they often center on the creation of legislative “box scores” designed to measure how many times a president’s preferred piece of legislation, or nominee to the executive branch or the courts, is approved by Congress. That is, how many pieces of legislation that the president supports actually pass Congress? How often do members of Congress vote with the president’s preferences?** How often is a president’s policy position supported by roll call outcomes? **These measures**, however, **are a misleading gauge of presidential power – they are a better indicator of congressional power.** This is because **how members of Congress vote on a** nominee or **legislative item is rarely influenced** **by anything a president does. Although journalists (and political scientists) often focus on the legislative “endgame” to gauge presidential influence – will the President swing enough votes to get his preferred legislation enacted? – this mistakes an outcome with actual evidence of presidential influence. Once we control for other factors – a member of Congress’ ideological and partisan leanings, the political leanings of her constituency, whether she’s up for reelection or not – we can usually predict how she will vote without needing to know much of anything about what the president wants.** (I am ignoring the importance of a president’s veto power for the moment.) **Despite the much publicized and celebrated instances of presidential arm-twisting during the legislative endgame, then, most legislative outcomes don’t depend on presidential lobbying.** But this is not to say that presidents lack influence. Instead, the primary means by which presidents influence what Congress does is through their ability to determine the alternatives from which Congress must choose. That is, presidential power is largely an exercise in agenda-setting – not arm-twisting. And we see this in the Sotomayer nomination. Barring a major scandal, she will almost certainly be confirmed to the Supreme Court whether Obama spends the confirmation hearings calling every Senator or instead spends the next few weeks ignoring the Senate debate in order to play Halo III on his Xbox. That is, how senators decide to vote on Sotomayor will have almost nothing to do with Obama’s lobbying from here on in (or lack thereof). His real influence has already occurred, in the decision to present Sotomayor as his nominee. If we want to measure Obama’s “power”, then, we need to know what his real preference was and why he chose Sotomayor. My guess – and it is only a guess – is that after conferring with leading Democrats and Republicans, he recognized the overriding practical political advantages accruing from choosing an Hispanic woman, with left-leaning credentials. We cannot know if this would have been his ideal choice based on judicial philosophy alone, but presidents are never free to act on their ideal preferences. Politics is the art of the possible. Whether Sotomayer is his first choice or not, however, her nomination is a reminder that the power of the presidency often resides in the president’s ability to dictate the alternatives from which Congress (or in this case the Senate) must choose. Although Republicans will undoubtedly attack Sotomayor for her judicial “activism” (citing in particular her decisions regarding promotion and affirmative action), her comments regarding the importance of gender and ethnicity in influencing her decisions, and her views regarding whether appellate courts “make” policy, they run the risk of alienating Hispanic voters – an increasingly influential voting bloc (to the extent that one can view Hispanics as a voting bloc!) I find it very hard to believe she will not be easily confirmed. In structuring the alternative before the Senate in this manner, then, Obama reveals an important aspect of presidential power that cannot be measured through legislative boxscores.

### 1ar – pc not key

**--8% chance of the internal link**

**Beckmann 11** [Matthew N Beckmann and Vimal Kumar 11, Associate Professor of Political Science at UC Irvine, econ prof at the Indian Institute of Tech, “Opportunism in Polarization”, Presidential Studies Quarterly; Sep 2011; 41, 3, CMR]

The final important piece in our theoretical model—**presidents' political capital**— also **finds support** in these analyses, **though** the **results** here **are less reliable**. **Presidents operating under the specter of strong economy and high approval ratings get an important, albeit moderate, increase in their chances for prevailing on "key" Senate roll-call votes** (b = .10, se = .06, p < .10). Figure 4 displays the substantive implications of these results in the context of polarization, showing that **going from the lower third of political capital to the upper third increases presidents' chances for success by 8 percentage points** (in a setting like 2008). **Thus, political capital's impact does provide an important boost to presidents' success on Capitol Hill, but** it is certainly not potent enough to overcome basic congressional realities. **Political capital is just strong enough to put a presidential thumb on the congressional scales, which often will not matter**, but can in close cases.

**--Presidential leadership’s irrelevant**

**Jacobs and King 10**, University of Minnesota, Nuffield College, (Lawrence and Desmond, “Varieties of Obamaism: Structure, Agency, and the Obama Presidency,” Perspectives on Politics (2010), 8: 793-802, CMR)

But **personality is not a solid foundation for a persuasive explanation of presidential impact and the shortfalls or accomplishments of Obama's presidency.** **Modern presidents** have brought divergent individual traits to their jobs and yet they **have** routinely failed **to enact much of their agendas**. Preeminent policy goals of Bill Clinton (health reform) and George W. Bush (Social Security privatization) met the same fate, though these presidents' personalities vary widely. And presidents like Jimmy Carter—whose personality traits have been criticized as ill-suited for effective leadership—enjoyed comparable or stronger success in Congress than presidents lauded for their personal knack for leadership—from Lyndon Johnson to Ronald Reagan.7 Indeed, **a personalistic account provides little leverage for explaining the disparities in Obama's record—for example why he succeeded legislatively in restructuring health care and higher education, failed in other areas**, and often accommodated stakeholders.

Decades **of rigorous research find that** impersonal**,** structural forces **offer the most compelling explanations for presidential impact**.8 **Quantitative research that compares legislative success and presidential personality finds** no overall relationship.9 In his magisterial qualitative and historical study, Stephen Skowronek reveals that institutional dynamics and ideological commitments structure presidential choice and success in ways that trump the personal predilections of individual presidents.10 Findings point to the predominant influence on presidential legislative success of the ideological and partisan composition of Congress, entrenched interests, identities, and institutional design, and a constitutional order that invites multiple and competing lines of authority.

**The widespread presumption**, then, **that Obama's** personal traits or **leadership style account for the obstacles to his policy proposals is called into question by** a generation of scholarship **on the presidency**. Indeed, **the presumption is** not simply problematic analytically, but practically as well. For **the misdiagnosis of the source of presidential weakness may**, paradoxically, **induce failure by distracting the White House from strategies and tactics where presidents can make a difference**. Following a meeting with Obama shortly after Brown's win, one Democratic senator lamented the White House's delusion that a presidential sales pitch will pass health reform—“Just declaring that he's still for it doesn't mean that it comes off life support.”11 Although Obama's re-engagement after the Brown victory did contribute to restarting reform, the senator's comment points to the importance of ideological and partisan coalitions in Congress, organizational combat, institutional roadblocks, and anticipated voter reactions. **Presidential sales pitches go** only so far.